

CRITICAL DEBATERS HANDBOOK

BY: JACKIE MASSEY

2011

DIRECTOR OF DEBATE

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

SOONERDEBATE.COM

“Not every debater can fit into the square hole of policy debate. Some people need round holes, or obtuse ones or no hole at all. I think each debater brings their own style to debate. The question is, do they take up a method of debate that allows them to access that style?”

This manual was an idea 2 years ago after our first Alternative Debate Workshop, The Call of the Loon. Now it has become a text that people can utilize to debate outside of the traditional policy debate style and method. Debate is Good!

INTRODUCTION:.....	4
RESEARCH:.....	11
DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE:	13
FRAMEWORK	17
WHAT IS POLITICS OR A POLITICAL ACT?	18
FORCE THE LINK BETWEEN THEIR FRAMEWORK EVIDENCE AND THEIR PARTICULAR ACTION.....	18
THE RISK OF A LINK.....	18
WHO CONTROLS POLITICS?	20
FRAMEWORK CENTRAL.....	21
CRITICAL FRAMEWORK ARGUMENTS IF YOU'RE NEGATIVE	24
DEBATING AFFIRMATIVE:	29
STRATEGIC AFFIRMATIVE THINKING!	31
IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF YOUR AFF K STRATEGY.....	31
DEBATING NEGATIVE:.....	32
THE LANGUAGE OF THE KRITIK.....	34
THE LINK DEBATE	37
IMPACT DEBATE.....	38
THE PERMUTATION.....	39
THE ALTERNATIVE:	42
ALTERNATIVE THEORY ARGUMENTS.....	44
DEBATING CRITICAL TEAMS	45
SPEED:	47
FLOW/GAME-BOARD:	49
WHAT IS EVIDENCE?	51

USE OF EVIDENCE:.....	51
CROSS-EXAMINATION:	52
WHAT IS AN OVERVIEW!.....	54
BEING PREPARED ON THE KEY ARGUMENTS	55
BEING A GOOD EVEN/IF DEBATER!	56
CHIT-CHAT	57
DEBATE 101 SUMMARY	58
CAPITALISM K BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	60
DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	64
FIRST PRIORITY TO FIRST AMERICANS BIBIOGRAPHY	67
FRAMEWORK K SUPPORT/DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE	69
FRAMEWORK ANTI-K BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	71
HEIDEGGER K BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	73
WHITENESS K BIBLIOGRAPHY!.....	76
COMMON ANSWERS TO KRITIKS	80

INTRODUCTION:

Debate is what we make it! There is no one definition of debate.

The purpose of this manual is to help offer you the knowledge to create the base to be an effective critical debater. I will use K, Kritik, critique, critical, and Kritical all interchangeably to mean the same thing. You shouldn't cite this manual as evidence in a debate round. You should use the arguments from the manual against your opponents in debate rounds. This manual is primarily for students who compete in cross-examination or policy debate on the high school and college level.

There are many different perspectives on when the "Kritik" was first utilized in college debate. I have heard a few different stories. All I can do is go with my story on how I was attracted to this type of debate. I was a former SIU debater under the direction of Bile. When I arrived at SIU, they were doing something unique in debate. In the final round of CEDA in 1989, they played what we called Jazz. Instead of debating out the legal precedence of law with Gonzaga, SIU made an argument that law is patriarchial and that we must question those notions before we can discuss what is "just". I got involved in the environmental ethic argument and found this concept of holism that was rather attractive and seemed like something to grasp onto. To add a little history and context, though, a group of debaters at the University of Texas in the 90's began to call some of their arguments "kritiks" to distinguish them from counter-plans, disadvantages, and other traditional arguments being used at the time. Working with coach Shanahan, Brody, McBride, Emerson, McPherson and many others started to bring philosophy more explicitly into policy debates by attacking the underlying assumptions of the debate and their opponent's arguments instead of taking the policy calculus and the agent of action for granted." I think Hester has a story on "putting the K in debate".

Debate has changed. There were times when some people were/are really good at a specific type of debate. As they get better at this type of debate, its logical that they would want debate to be what they were good at. The same is true for the critical debater. They would rather debate be something else that gives them a chance. Neither side is wrong; the question is who can best defend what they do. Even I was taught that debate was stock issues. Five prima-facia issues, like it was all in clear bright-lines. But as time has passed, debate has changed. The technology, the people, the methods and world predicaments have all evolved.

Not every debater can fit into the square hole of policy debate. Some people need round holes, or obtuse ones or no hole at all. I think each debater brings their own style to debate. The question is, do they take up a method of debate that allows them to access that style?

I also advise you to read Sun Tzu's Art of War. One important thing is to respect policy debate, especially when it is done well. You must assume every round your

opponent will be at their best. Two things rise to the top in a good debate. Who has a good argument and who has good evidence to support their argument?

We are all performance teams.....It's all a performance.....

The best K debaters are the ones who understand how people misinterpret what K debaters do, and how most arguments made against critical positions only function around false stereotypes. As you will see, if you do not engage in faulty K debate, then most of the common theory arguments to dismiss criticisms have no impact on your argument. Stay ahead of the curve. What are people mostly saying, and how do I avoid debating it or, how do I defeat it soundly? As you utilize this guide, you will see how you can play off of the misinformed perspectives people have about K debaters. Much of this comes from people wanting to not go in the square hole, but lack the knowledge and experience to take up the best method. And thus we have bad K debate, just like we have bad policy debate.

What is a Kritik? I do not want to give an exclusionary example that would prevent certain arguments from being a Kritik. Traditionally, in debate we were taught the basic 5 prima-facia issues that must be met to have a legitimate affirmative. Many arguments were what I would call process-oriented arguments. As people were taught to have advantages to their plan, and disadvantages to the other teams plans. There then became the common theme of having a few components of a (dis)advantage that include – A: Link. B: Uniqueness C: Brink D: Impact or LUBI. The ability to have uniqueness within your argument was a key deciding factor for many debates. People would determine do you have a unique advantage or disadvantage. For many years in debate, just an impact of causing economic downturn and more unemployment was enough to win debates. Then one day someone realized that what we would fear the most is a war. This impact grew to an escalating war that would then turn nuclear. It was the drive to find the biggest impact that could affect the most people. But it was also along the same methodological lines as the scare tactics utilized during the cold war. So for many years, people would look for a unique link to the risk of a nuclear war. There were people who would argue racism as an impact, but many times because racism exists, and is hard to measure, the risk of a unique link to a nuclear war outweighed incremental mitigations of racism. The same could be said for sexism or homophobia. So what is a critique? It is the criticizing of the values/ideals /philosophy embodied within the basic support for the plan. This could be an examination of modes, methods, ontologies, ethics, discourse or solutions. What made it very hard for these impacts to be included in debate is how they compare to asking the question “Does plan solve?”. So there has always been a need to try and have “solvency” in debate, which means that if you deal with problems that cannot be “solved”, then it was hard to win a debate. Especially when people learn to use arguments like time-frame to say that we need to worry about this short-term impact that we can calculate, rather than impacts that we can never see solution or final impact from. So when you read a critique and the other team reads “calculability good”, you can see where such an argument gets its strategic base.

IS DEBATE A GAME OR A TRAINING GROUND FOR ADVOCACY?

Is debate a game or is it a place to practice advocacy? This is where I find a lot of people decide they would rather be a K debater than a policy debater. It's okay to be both, but there are only so many tournaments and so much prep, and not everyone has those resources. That's either a personal choice, or one dictated by coaches. But for those who choose an alternative style of debate, I offer you the Kritical Debaters Handbook. In my opinion, many policy debaters refuse to try and read the literature of the philosophical K, and find themselves staring at evidence that they cannot comprehend. At most they look at a word on the block and hope they have a file to match it. I see this as a challenge of intellect. As a debater, it feels so great to know the other team cannot understand what your arguments are. The challenge is this:

CAN I GO THROUGH THE EXTENSIVELY TESTED AND WIDELY ACCEPTED TRADITIONAL POLICY DEBATE ARGUMENTS AND NOT DROP ANYTHING?

That really is the challenge. So you have to be ready. This guide is an attempt to tell you what the commonly used arguments are and I hope to provide some insight on how to best address the bad ones and make the good ones. I try to provide a lot of checklists and lists of things to be prepared for.

Common Stereotypes:

K debaters are lazy

You say you win because you dance

You say you win because you're oppressed. (Oppression Olympics)

K debaters are cheaters

K's don't do anything

ARGUMENT:

What is the difference between your argument and my argument, and why is that important?

One thing you will find about my advice in relation to the way debate arguments are constructed revolves around notions of absolutism. If you can learn how to criticize arguments that foreclose thinking, you have made your first big step in being a critical debater. When I debated we referred to this as *holism*.

A good argument is a good argument. I think it's called a Kritik because it's not about those things that can be measured objectively, and thus, can be written off in favor of more "tangible" things that people have decided to be real or true. A good argument says that:

- a. Your literature is bad/your theories/schools of thought etc.
- b. You don't solve – a better K has a Kritik of the idea of "solvency"
- c. You make things worse/Impacts inevitable absent "alt"
- d. This is the most important thing in this debate -- IE – Impact calculus

There is much debate about "do you need an alternative?" In my view, the theories about how the components of the K should function are only responses to the methods chosen by the policy debaters to answer the K. At first it was framework, as though a K wasn't an argument. Then, it was just the permutation, pass the plan and say X is bad. Then, the K response was, "well if that is all that can beat me, 1nr will make sure we will not lose the perm." After 1ar's decided this was too much, another strategy came along: "What's the alternative?" Then, the standard response by the affirmative was that the negative was stuck with the status quo. So, the K response was rather lucid, alternatives like "We should all love each other" or "we should void our life of "desire"" or "we should embrace our insecurities". There was no way for these alternatives to be actualized, which resulted in the categorization of K debate as too "Utopian", which sparked the argument "utopian alternatives are abusive". But K debaters dug a little deeper. Along with having this debate about your criticism, you were also forced to beat the policy teams on this "framework" debate, or otherwise it becomes a silver bullet against your broad-based argument. Then some debaters tried the floating pic (plan inclusive counter-plan). "We support all of your affirmative except your representations", and then argued there were representations in the 1ac that would make the plan worse. The floating pics theory blocks became as popular as Mead cards then, so the K debater made another move. This time the alternative changed to rejecting the affirmative. Sounds simple right? With this strategy, your purpose is to prove that there are benefits to rejecting the affirmative form of politics.

The alternative is to reject the affirmative because they have a bad form of "politics".

The term politics is such a broad term, that you can then access many reasons why their policy was bad. Use of the State, ontology, epistemology, or ethics....just a few

examples of where you can find a place to disagree, and then be prepared to argue why this is most important.

I will say that there are strategic reasons to use the alternative like a counter-plan. For years the K debater was trying to use their impacts to outweigh the affirmative, and this was such an uphill struggle. But then if you get strategic, you can make it a downhill joyride. If the alternative solves the affirmative, then you only have to win impacts to the affirmative from your links that the alternative does not link too. This type of K debating is much more functional in front of people who have been deciding debates of plan vs. counter-plan...it is one way they can not totally comprehend the K, but still be able to see that it is preferable to the affirmative. This is also a good explanation as to why word exclusion counter-plans are good. You rewrite the plan without a particular word in it, and then have arguments as to why this word you left out is a bad word and not using it is better. People also use the "erasure" method, where they have a counter-plan that puts the word under erasure. (Derrida) Some people draw lines through the debatable words in their plan, and are ready to argue erasure solves better than doing the plan without the word. (IE – don't forget the past is one argument).

There is no one-way to be a K debater, you really have to see the different strategies, and choose those wisely based upon the evidence and the argument you want to make.

A common strategy for any argument based game is that if I am affirmative, and I can prove your arguments don't disagree with me, then you did not refute my argument. In competitive debate we call this the no link and the permutation.

A common strategy on the negative is to find one small place to disagree, but really exploit it. Strategies that attempt to deny everything the affirmative says will be an uphill battle.

Straight from the Bible:

Negative Cx of 1AC – 2N "Do I have to disagree with everything you say?"

1A – "NO" (I mean wouldn't they look abusive if they said yes – Neg could never win)

2N – "Who gets to choose where we disagree?"

1A – "You do" (If they say they do, once again Neg could never win)

And there you have it. I choose to disagree with:

Their Language choice – IE Language Kritiks

Their Methodology - IE Method Kritiks

Their representations – IE Representations Kritiks

Their philosophy – IE it's never ending.....There are infinite ways to disagree.

This sounds like a good affirmative whine against the K right?wrong.....the next step is important. Why is this place where you disagree important? The real question becomes, why is it more important than the “plan”?

When I attempt to determine what would be a good affirmative or negative argument. I spend time analyzing what everyone else is saying, and construct a logical argument in my head/or on paper, and then go out and find the evidence to support what I want to say. IE – See it as a debate argument, not just an author or evidence. After you see how you will utilize this argument you have created, find the evidence that helps you engage the key part of the debate that you have determined to be important places of departure. Sometimes you will find that much of what you have to say is from the same author, but that only causes people to think your argument is “author” based rather than created as a competitive debate argument.

My advice on using the guide is to read it once. Then choose your argument and go back and read it again. It's okay to use the paragraphs or sentences from this guide as your argument, I would prefer this much more than saying “Massey, 2011” before you made the argument. Don't waste your time with the cite, this guy is probably not as credible as you.

RESEARCH:

Choose an area of the library – You need evidence to survive the debate after the debate. What is that? That is when the judge(s) take 20 – 30 minutes making their decision(s) and need evidence to read to be refreshed on the arguments. The best K teams are great researchers. But it really means they see what is needed for arguments, and then go out and find an argument and the literature that supports it. I can't take the time to tell you how to be a great researcher in this volume. I will say that you need to spend time at the library, or create your own. There seems to be some unique value in books that helps critical debaters. There are a lot of books online of course, but there are so many more that are not. If your stuff is from books, people have a more difficult time poking holes in what you say. If your stuff is from online sources, your opponents can read your whole argument and articles before they debate you, and the best K debaters know how to take your stuff, and lock you into a link in defense of something. A good Kritik always has a link. You have to do the research to have those links. In doing your research, remember a good Kritik is a good argument. As a debater, you must get good at something, before you can be good at anything. Logical right? In other words, take an argument and stick with it until you make it win. Sometimes it takes a year, and sometimes it takes a weekend. Don't invest time in an argument, then toss it aside after not succeeding with it at first. Keep with it. This is where research becomes important. If you really know your area of the library, as soon as the other team mentions the name of an author, you should know what the most and best arguments that could be made by that author. If you haven't read it, then get the citation, and make sure you read it as soon as possible. Keep researching. One benefit you have as a kritik debater that is strategic is most traditional policy debate arguments that are framework or topicality do not have a lot of evidence to support their substantive debate, while the K teams have evidence rather than theory blocks.

Spend time at the shelves.

This is where great K debaters sprout, is at the shelves of the real library. Don't jot down the call numbers and go to each call number. Jot down the call numbers, and then spend time in that whole section of the library. Lay your bag down. Set up camp.

Step 1 – Pull off all books that seem either new or relevant.

To determine new, it's easy, look for the very white book tag/call number. The whiter it is, the newer the book. Look at all new books (last 2 years) even if the title is not that crafty. I usually look on the index in the back of the book to see if there are key words and then look at the chapters.

Step 2 – Sort out the junk.

This is where you then go through the 20 books you pulled off the shelf to take the time to see if it's worth checking out or skimming. I can usually tell how an author writes by reading a few pages, to determine if they will be saying what I need.

Step 3 – Finding argument components, not paragraphs

It is okay to soak up the knowledge each and every book offers, but you don't have time to put each component of knowledge into evidence. If the writing is explanatory or "fact based", then you don't really need it as evidence. This is why I like to flush out my whole argument (draw it out in a chart with answers to etc.), and then when I read, if it doesn't fall into a part of my argument structure, then I don't "cut it" as evidence, I soak up the knowledge.

Step 4 Finish!

Don't be the one who always had stuff on their jump drive or had the cards cut, but no tags. You have to finish. You can't do everything at once, so you have to set down and do small projects that result in finished usable items. Don't take on new projects until you can finish the one you're on. Otherwise you're always only halfway ready.

RESEARCH TIPS

- **Follow the footnotes, they lead you to great places**
- **Books have the best "answers to" ...**
- **Don't cut everything, just read everything (know what can possibly be said)**
- **Think of your argument as a debate argument first, then find the evidence**
- **Don't cut a losing piece of evidence....find a better one...**
- **Go to "google" and type in exactly what you want it to say (you will be surprised)**
- **Use "quotes" in your searches**
- **Be thorough...If you want to own the argument you have to know most of what is said...when they say an authors name, you should already know their argument**
- **Get cites/Use wikis to make sure your seeing what other people have**

DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE:

As I said earlier, Debate is what we make it. Many debates that involve the K include an aspect of a “debate about debate” to help understand how the arguments compete with each other. I see these debates as unnecessary, but they must be comprehended if you ever want your argument to have impact in the debate. In my experience, once you understand how to beat these arguments, your win percentage will increase dramatically. This is the gateway to victories with Kritical debate.

Switch side debate: Much of my information I infer in the following discussion is in the Hicks and Green article Lost Convictions.

Back in 1954 there was turbulence in the NDT Community concerning the topic.

Burns claims that the framers of the resolution did not think debaters would succumb to Communist propaganda and argue China good, there was an assumption that people would argue we must pull China away from Moscow.

The debate about debate occurred for about 10 years, and then in 1964 McCrosky and Klopff declared the debate about debate closed. It wasn't really closed, they just declared it closed. Since then, there hasn't been much debate about switch side debate in the literature beyond the Muir article and the Hicks and Green article. I do have a thorough list in the “Debate about Debate” Bibliography.

My perspective on advocacy overrides my love for “the game” of debate. I feel like that the best way to critically test arguments or ideas cannot be found in the head-on denial of yes/no or good/bad. As the arguments play out for switch side debate, they begin with the concept that the best way to learn about something is to research both sides of the issue. One of the best arguments for “switch side” debate is based upon this concept of learning the most about something. However, the key question becomes should a student have to verbalize things they disagree with? Should you publicly utter racism is good for the purpose of having a debate? The part about learning both sides can happen without actually saying it in the debate, the desire to win in debate forces you into researching both sides. Do you really need to utter things you disagree with? I feel that you should not, especially in debate. If you are an individual that has experienced any form of oppression, why would you want to play the role of the oppressor? This is where I also feel critical thinking can be better tested. We don't have to disagree that sexism exists and is bad, we can disagree on how we should combat it. It's where you disagree that becomes important. Just saying yes/no stifles creative thinking that can really offer functional helpful tests for critical ideas.

Here are some good arguments for why defending something you disagree with is bad! (all debatable of course)

1. Public utterance is public commitment – should not separate speech from conviction
2. Policy debate is public debate – when we separate is when admin sees as a game and debate dies
3. Should not value technique over substance – There are times where substance should be secondary.
4. Speaking/Verbalizing evils does not help to understand, but draws one close to the middle
5. Technique in debate does not translate into effective communication skills
6. Focus on technique is exclusionary on all levels – HS/college/and judging pool
8. Should not divorce the rhetorical from the dialectical
9. Without conviction, narrow topics do not result in a positive educational experience
10. Should not decouple the sincerity principle from argument presented by debater
11. Accepting strict notions of switch side debate forces one to replace beliefs with appreciation for the process.

Is debate rhetorical or dialectical?

My contention in this debate is that it is both. To have effective agency outside of debate for most who participate, we need to respect the rhetorical and dialectical benefits of debate.

Is competitive debate “public debate”?

My contention is in line with Murphy’s contention that a public utterance is a public commitment. We contend that discourse does create reality, and those who watch the debates are definitely effected. The desire to create the public/private dichotomy should be resisted for many significant reasons.

Should debaters be forced into arguing for what you disagree with and separate conviction from speech?

My position is that debate can be a training ground for discussing those issues that are important to you, and give you agency for dealing with your own personal oppressions and inequalities. We also contend that we will always debate negative, and feel that going negative, doing research, and having discussion is a place where you can get all of the theoretical benefits of switch side debating, without uttering the very words that foster personal oppression.

Is it important to Verbalize things you disagree with?

My contention is that this verbalization serves to pull a student to the center, thus explaining the role of debate as a form of cultural technology. Resolutions are designed to portray an aura of inclusiveness, while serving to only allow one side to be heard. My contention is that speaking affirmative is where you find conviction, and the advantages of learning to effectively address oppression that effects your own personal agency is better than attempting to acquire a nebulous method of verbalizing that serves as a tool to coopt radical beliefs.

PARTICIPATION VS. COMPETITION

Participation is more important than competition. The benefits of an educational form of debate being able to access more people is better than a bankrupt form of education that is accessed by less people.

My contention is that one of the overarching problems with emphasis on the game strategy of switch side debate was the problem of elevating technique over substance.

Debate has made a turn from the game envisioned in switch side to the modeling of policy makers in the legislative halls. The reason for claiming it is OK to value technique over substance was because we were not modeling the legislative halls, and are creating our own game. Now many debaters construct arguments attempting to equate our forum with the legislative halls, and thus offering a method of education that has been deemed un-accessible by past proponents of switch side debating.

Using switch side debate to force students to defend views that are not their own is attempting to use debate to produce the liberal citizen, thus treating debaters as "subjects" to be converted one at a time to become a tool of global governance using universal norms for the exceptionalist subject to govern the world. There is a good debate to be had about if this is good or bad.

STRICT SWITCH SIDE DEBATE MAKES DEBATE A FORM OF CULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

The debate about debate highlights how communication becomes an object, instrument, and field of cultural governance. This is a production in the power of cultural governance through three mechanisms

1. To separate speech from conviction
2. Decouple sincerity principle from argument presented by debater.
3. Forces one to replace beliefs with appreciation for the process

ANSWERS TO MUIR

Muir's support for switch side debate is based upon universal norms such as tolerance and pluralism, though Muir attempts to claim that debate maintains a sense of moral development. We must examine how Muir reassigns conviction to the process of generating morally sound judgment. Muir sees switch side debate as a tool for deliberative democracy and game of freedom. This notion of switch side debate pre-configures a deliberative moral theory of democracy.

I will also make it known that there was a moment before the merger where people attempted to produce publications to try and promote NDT debate over CEDA debate, and other forms of debate, because of the incredible shrinkage of the NDT debate community. So some of these writings had a purpose at the time that wasn't far from Madison Avenue.

There is no rulebook on debate, nor is it totally agreed upon that we are doing "switch side debate". In the past, resolutions were very generic, and people just basically affirmed the resolution. Most affirmatives were the same. Now that we have a generic (but specific) resolution, and people inductively infer their plan as affirming the resolution, we aren't switching sides on a generic issue; we are debating whatever the affirmative says.

If you are arguing racism exists, and the other team says switch side debate good, you say "switch sides then" ...and argue that the claim to know is how we keep racism hidden. Those arguments where debaters claim their only ground is "racism bad" is a double turn to their switch side debate good arguments.

FRAMEWORK

Framework: There is no one meaning to 'Framework', it depends on how it is being used in the debate.

This argument has become quiet common in many debates. For me, I feel it is just an impact debate, but for many it becomes a rules type argument. The idea that some issues have no relevance because of the creation of a false bright-line that creates a distinction between what impacts count and which ones don't isn't very logical to me. When I debated there was this debate about whether you can separate values from policies. Most critical thinkers would agree that these two are inseparable.

Obviously, when K debaters say fiat is illusory, the policy debaters are not blown away, but rather feel as though we agree to pretend to be policymakers. So the first decision you make as you prepare for debates is "Who are we? What are we doing?"

Do I want to play in a world of Fiat?

CX question: Will your plan be passed? Will you defend the USFG doing your plan?

You have to be prepared to answer these questions without wavering. Most K teams lose many debates on framework or alt theory because they are not consistent in how they jump through the policy 101 gauntlet of arguments and assumptions.

Example: If you are going to "K" up the impacts the negative reads, i.e., nuclear war scenarios or environmental collapse....then its okay to give the other team ground to make those arguments, just make sure you stay tight on making sure they get no leaps of logic within their evidence as they move through their link chains to reach their impacts. But there is no need to say "no link" to the argument that you do something if you can beat the argument other ways.

Some people like to see framework as place where you can argue a whole conglomeration of things and hope that in the end, they can argue they are one of those things, and thus their approach is better. Examples: Realism good, or predictions good, or securitization good or pragmatism good or utilitarianism good or fear of death good.....there are more, but I think you get the point. You need to be able to address these arguments with a method.

My first suggestion is have a K of the idea of framework. This can be utilized as offense against the way they are using whatever arguments they choose. Some arguments would be generic "rules bad" arguments, or exclusionary ideologies bad.

My second suggestion is to use the language of debate when necessary. Example – Who controls uniqueness on framework? Well? The US has been at war every year since its inception. We have many small wars around the globe, environmental crises, natural disasters pushed by those environmental consequences, economic downturns and spirals. More wars are likely to gain control of the oil to feed the US

petroleum culture. And this is where their “framework” ideologies have gotten us, so why would we continue? ...The K debater controls uniqueness on framework.

Now, let's get more specific: What about debate? Well most of the people that succeed in the current dominant/popular method of policy debate are many times privileged and have many weeks of summer camp, are white and male. Many of the arguments in the debate about debate will work to help you on what the current form of debate teaches you. What are we doing? What is our purpose? What is education?

As a K debater, you want to punish people for arguing framework. To do this, you need to be ready to be on the attack when they reveal their “framework” interpretation.

WHAT IS POLITICS OR A POLITICAL ACT?

This is an important question for debaters. If someone uses sexist or racist language, is that good politics? Does it effect if plan will solve or not? I once heard a judge tell a debater that if one team used racist language, but the plan solved, then he would vote for the plan, but dock their speaker points. To me, this leads us into a discussion about “in round impacts”. This may be one of the ways kritiks made their way into debate. It became strategic to only go for sexist language in the debate if the other team used blatant sexist language. People would argue that discourse is the most important because what happens in the debate are the only “real” impacts in the debate. Sexist/Racist/Homophobic language creates an unwelcome and unfair playing field for those whom such language does violence against. To me, all debate speeches are political, and the decision has a lot to do with politics. A larger question is one that investigates how ethics, discourse, epistemology, ontology or performance defines the political act. The plan can only aspire to the value of the political act attempting to support it. This is where your research would attempt to be better than theirs on how much of a role the area you choose to disagree at has on the success of the political act. There are so many ways to investigate the “political”.

FORCE THE LINK BETWEEN THEIR FRAMEWORK EVIDENCE AND THEIR PARTICULAR ACTION

Every framework argument they make should be forced to tie itself to the politics of the 1ac. They may read 100 cards on how there are good policy actions, and how we need policy, but it's a question of their policy. Keep tight on this debate. This is where CX becomes important once again.

THE RISK OF A LINK

I never liked this concept very much, either there is a link, or there is not. However, many people disagree. There are many ways that smart policy teams are now putting together more substantive arguments into their framework argument. Combining this idea that the negative K has to defend the status quo and that there is a chance the affirmative might accidentally mitigate a larger problem in a risk calculus. There are many different ways to say we must act. There are also some

common arguments that say Kritiks do nothing, and we need critique and action. These are the kind of debates where K debaters get stuck with weighing their “non-unique” impacts against the “risk” of a link the affirmative may have to some large extinction impact. Many judges fall on the side of extinction when this happens. This means you need to stay focused on what is the most important issue in the debate. This also means you can’t just spot them extinction. When they say 100% risk of extinction, you have failed to do your part in indicting their arguments. Be real. There is no way any affirmative on any topic implemented would actually “solve” extinction, ever. That’s moronic and only in debate does that make sense. It’s your job to make sure it doesn’t make sense. You have to indict their impact by claiming their evidence doesn’t say it will occur. You then have to make sure you prove there is no internal link in how their affirmative could actually be the single factor in addressing extinction. YOU CANNOT SPOT THEM THEIR ADVANTAGES OR THEIR DISADVANTAGES. Then you should also have some things to say about the ideology behind the politics of fear utilized by their authors. For a lot of this you don’t need evidence. Read the “makes no sense DA” if you have to.

Predictions debate: Realism debate: (Mearsheimer and Murray) Science good debate: Utilitarianism debate:

All of these are debates you need to be ready to answer. Some of Mearsheimer’s arguments say we need to pretend to be role players. This is somewhat of a debate about debate argument. Your answer should be slanted towards claiming that even if we were “role-playing”, that does not deny that we should not learn in the debate rounds how certain ideologies/philosophies cause impacts in our world. That argument would only supercharge your argument if you are intersecting with their idea of “political”. If you are saying we are just debaters, and making other arguments that do not engage the “political”, then you open yourself up to more of the framework theory arguments most policy teams make against K teams.

WHO CONTROLS POLITICS?

Many people call this “cede the political.” This argument claims that if we do not engage in politics, then the right wing will take over, and all of the impacts you identify in your criticism will be worse. Your answer to this argument has to be a uniqueness style argument. Many people like to position themselves as not falling within the “evil” part of the political spectrum, while still endorsing the same type of policies. You have to be able to defend why your position of not engaging politics, if you do (hopefully your argument is about the political), and I think one position you can take is to argue that what you call the “political” is a very limited view of where politics happens. But I think the best argument to make is that you are challenging those who they claim you would be ceding too, in this debate. If you win the other teams arguments only reify the existing political system, then challenging their argument is a challenge to that political. You’re not ceding, you are engaging. This argument works best for the policy teams when you choose to not engage the “state” by doing such things as refusing to affirm the USFG. Be prepared.

Here is an example:

Cedes power to aggressive and reactionary elites that will cause extinction absent political engagement

Carl Boggs (Los Angeles Campus ... Faculty Professor) 1997 “The Great Retreat”

Another argument that dovetails with this one is:

Arguing that representations determine reality destroys effective political action

Jarvis, 00 (Darryl, lecturer in IR ... and the challenge of postmodernism, 2000, p. 189-)

FRAMEWORK CENTRAL

SAMPLE #1 - Framework – interpretation: The sole purpose of the ballot is to answer the resolutional question: is the enactment of a topical plan better than the status quo or a competitive policy option?

This is an interesting description of what debate should be. There is no place that makes it this. There is no rulebook, or agency that carries such a rule out. Is debate supposed to answer the resolutional question, or is the resolution just a fence the plan has to fall into? Voting affirmative in a lot of debates does not answer the resolutional questions. Most affirmatives are not adequate inductive logical steps that prove the general statement of the resolution true. What am I saying? I am saying that there are fallacies in logic that one must recognize when people want to start talking about whether we are debating the “truth” of the resolution.

All birds can fly.

An ostrich is a bird

Therefore an ostrich can fly.....

Most affirmatives are ostriches, not blue jays or robins, and thus are examples of the resolution, but not necessarily representative of the general truth of the resolution.

SAMPLE #2 - Framework: This debate is about evaluating if a topical plan is better than the status quo or a competitive policy option?

Many people go out of their way to make sure we know this is “policy” debate. We have the “policy debate” round robin. At first this distinction was one based on seeing the difference between CEDA and NDT. Then the distinction was used to identify the difference between CEDA/NDT and Parliamentary debate. Now it is being used to try and create distinctions between argument styles in the CEDA/NDT community.

By accessing the affirmative through their “politics” you are evaluating if the topical plan is bad, but this phrase tries to make it only a uniqueness issue. Once again, where does this type of thinking originate from that says this is the best way to compare something; this is answered by who controls uniqueness. The simple, “your kritik is a non-unique disadvantage” argument is used a lot here. You have to learn how to argue that each incremental link makes the status quo worse. Remember, a good argument says you frame the problem badly, you don’t solve, and you make things worse. Also, your purpose is to build in access points to their affirmative with your argument that allow you to void their framework arguments. They spend time on framework, while you’re spending time accessing their framework with your argument. I really want to stress that most framework/topicality/K theory arguments are slanted towards “faulty” K debate and stereotypes. If you can disconnect their theory (i.e., framework screens) from

your argument, then you will win most of the time. Here is your education turn, claim that this then forces teams to actually go out and research your argument. Once you get good at voiding their misinformed arguments, your success rate should rise dramatically.

SAMPLE #3 - Our interpretation is that the negative gets to defend a competitive policy alternative

a. Predictability – there are millions of representations that we can't predict – the resolution says USFG so we should debate that – predictability is key to fairness

b. Education – policy discussions foster better informed debate that can be adapted to the real world

c. Switch side debate solves any risk of debate being unethical – their arguments are based in a lack of understanding of the activity and how it works to shape students - Abbott,2009

This is the type of framework argument where you should lean more on your framework Kritik. This argument makes so many assumptions about a "Kritik", including *that they are all the same or make the same arguments, or can all be put in one barrel at one time, because they're not "policy arguments" and so they must be K arguments.*

So this argument is saying that the only way the negative can disagree, is with a counter-plan. Hmmm. That's it huh? Seems somewhat abusive. Obviously, if your argument is a case turn, it would compete. This argument has such a narrow interpretation of politics. Most good Kritiks will criticize this narrow interpretation of politics, and should be ready to argue how this way of thinking/politics is bad.

The argument that there are millions of representations are true, unfortunately the negative should be talking about the ones that were offered up in the 1ac. They had 9 minutes to speak, they chose what to say, that is called a political act. Any arguments saying they are not stuck to their representations are pretty much legitimizing the affirmative severing links from the 1ac.

Here are some common T/Framework authors people read. If you really want to be the amazing K debater you should know what each and every one of these authors say. If you can find a camp framework file lying around, you can actually see how they are used. Read these people. Study them. If you are a K debater in high school and college, then you might as well get on with knowing the basic authors people read against you. That is part of researching. When they say one of these authors' names, you should know what the evidence can say.

Here are some very popular authors used against critical/alternative teams:

Michael Ignatieff, 2004 - Carr Professor of Human Rights Practice, Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at the JFK School of Government, Harvard University, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*, p. 20-1

Ruth Lessl Shively 2000 - Associate Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, *Political Theory and Partisan Politics*, p. 182-3

Adolf G. Gundersen, 2000 - Associate Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, Political Theory and Partisan Politics, p. 108-9

John Rawls. 1999, The Law of Peoples, p. 56-57

Alan Coverstone, 1995 - "An Inward Glance: A Response To Mitchell's Outward Activist Turn," DRG, URL: <http://www.wfu.edu/Student-organizations/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Coverstone1995China.htm>

Owen 02, University of Southampton (David, "Reorienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning", Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 31, No. 3, <http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/3/653>)

Fine, 2000 - Department of Sociology Northwestern University - Gary, "GAMES AND TRUTHS: Learning To Construct Social Problems In High School Debate", 103-104.

Boggs, 1997 - Professor of Political Science, '97 - Carl, National University, Theory & Society 26, December, p. 760-1.

Sankaran Krishna, 1993 - Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, Alternatives, v. 18

Best and Kellner, 2001 - Steven Best, Assoc. Prof Phil. And Human. U Texas and Douglas Kellner, Phil. Of Ed. Chair, "Postmodern Politics and the Battle for the Future," Illuminations, www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/kell28.htm

Muir 1993 - Star A. PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC, "A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate," v26, n4, p.288

Shampa Biswas, 2007 - Professor of Politics at Whitman College, December 2007, "Empire and Global Public Intellectuals: Reading Edward Said as an International Relations Theorist," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 36, No. 1, p. 124

John J. Mearsheimer, 1995 - Realism heavyweight champion, International Security, Vol. 20, No

Alastair J.H. Murray, 1997 - Politics AND Realism

Fuyuki Kurusawa 2004'Constellations Vol 11 No. 4

Todd May, 2005, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM • vol 31 nos 5-6 • pp. 517-531

David E. McClean, 2001 - The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope - Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy.

P. H. LIOTTA, 2005 - Security Dialogue - Vol. 36(1): 49-70

CRITICAL FRAMEWORK ARGUMENTS IF YOU'RE NEGATIVE

There is a time when you debate teams that will not defend anything. This is one reason why the 1st Priority to 1st Americans argument was a successful debate argument. Teams that choose to defend nothing, rely upon a meta-argument that might say absolutes are bad. Or we need to be in constant change. (See Mann and DeLeuze and Guattari.)

You need a critical argument that says not taking a stance on anything or constant deferral bad. Some people like to make this argument in relation to a framework argument that might say lack of debate about politics or including everyone creates worse long-term violence or that there are times we need to exclude to prevent violence. If you are a person who feels you have to struggle day to day with oppression such as sexism or racism, then you should have an advantage over those who privilege just thinking or empty space in the place of a chance to engage in revolutionary politics.

Raasch is one example. This argument says that exclusions are good, and we must debate about issues, not let it be.

Agonism good is another argument that would say they avoid the need for contestation.

Hegemonic competition is more of a theory argument that would say the affirmative allows no space for you to debate, and will use that advantage to win a competition. This form of unfair competition can be identified as hegemonic as opposed to cooperative competition, where disagreeing is required. These are examples, and you may find your own. Just make sure you have a strategy.

TOPICALITY

Words can bend. Words can be interpreted different ways. Once a resolution is written, it is what it is. There is no one standard “prediction” people make about legitimate arguments, only an expected rehashing of past arguments. For high school debaters, the topics seem to be less politically created, and I find them much more accessible to creative and innovate debate. I will identify some of the key debates you should be ready for when you read your affirmative.

It baffles me at how the force of technology is ever changing our ability to research and access more information at a faster pace, people start to feel like we need to limit the possible interpretations of the topic. Why do we want a limited topic?

This is based upon the perspective that for us to have good, educational debate, we need to make sure the resolutions are narrow enough so that everyone would have evidence on all of the possible affirmatives. If we allow too many affirmatives, then we can't possibly research all of them. It's odd that people say this, but at the same time read the same scenarios and Mead evidence year after year.

There is a larger abstract reason why I feel people like limited resolutions. If you find a method and can become an expert in organizing and technically managing evidence in the debate, then a limited topic benefits your style. Too me, there is a pedagogical reason why policy debaters prefer limited topics. For kritik debaters, their arguments are broad enough to catch a large amount of possible affirmatives.

Which leads to the question, are generic arguments good/bad for debate?

I feel that a good argument is a good argument. If something is so prominent that it applies to a lot of things, then maybe it should be discussed, rather than being written off as generic. And, like I said, it's not like the policy debate world is doing nothing more than regurgitating the same extinction scenarios year after year.

Some people like to have offense on topicality. I used to be of the school that said that we have to reject the topic, but have become more of a supporter of we can re-interpret the topic. Maybe you want to “affirm the resolution of xxxxx (insert topic) as a metaphor for.....”

You have to be creative, but you have to affirm something. It really is an uphill battle to just reject the resolution.

If you have an interpretation though, then you have the ability to have offense on the “competing interpretations” by claiming that the normative reasons you have to interpret the topic this way are more important than the competitive reasons you have for limiting the topic discussion.

There are topics where there are debates about how we should interpret certain words that really do come down to normative reasons to prefer vs. competing interpretations.

Example #1- A topic that says to X “nations” ...especially like Africa and Eastern Europe. You have your affirmative that provides X to a people who are being denied “nationhood” and utilize their arguments in the literature on why they should be a nation as your topicality evidence.

Example #2 – A topic that gives “development” assistance. There are many authors who write that the term “development” is racist. So if you choose to not be traditional modes of “development” assistance, you have some good reasons to prefer your interpretation that goes beyond how it limits the topic.

Can you really choose one definition as being right over the other?

This is where I think false dichotomies are created, when we attempt to ascertain one interpretation as a legitimate interpretation, but not the most limiting definition. Should you really lose a debate for this? You really need some “offense” on limiting interpretations. One example is to argue the negative interpretations over-limits, and their interpretations excludes important debate. Weigh the amount of good in depth debate gained over the incremental amount of bad debate lost.

Here is my bold statement for this section. Topics are framed based upon 2 important factors – What evidence is available (what does the mainstream literature say) and how would this work in debate (what ground would negative and affirmative have)! These 2 framing factors are a product of ideological/ontological/epistemological perspectives that are juxtaposed to other perspectives on these issues, but offered up in the resolutions as neutral. The wording and “key phrases” force debaters to either to take up the mainstream side while on the affirmative, or have to debate the topicality gauntlet. Not all topics are this way, nor is it inherent in a debate topic. But the current college topic process does suffer from this illness. We should open up topics to allow the alternative literature base go affirmative. When you’re negative, you answer the affirmative. So radical/alternative/minority solutions to topic problem areas are never an affirmative option without having to debate topicality in most debates.

In your defense of your interpretation on topicality there are 3 things you should be saying:

- **Education is most important, not competitive equity.**
 - **Participation is more important than competitive equity.**
 - **Competitive equity from limiting the resolution is subjective and debatable. Your participation and education claims on a normative level are not.**
- NORMATIVE REASONS TO PREFER YOUR INTERPRETATION OUTWEIGH THEIR FAIRNESS.**

THE TOPICALITY GAUNTLET!

You need to be ready to walk through the gauntlet of perfected T arguments if you want to be a successful K debater. My view is that you should win most or all of your negative rounds, and unstoppable success really depends on you having a good affirmative. So if you want to be good on the affirmative, one thing you have to be able to do is prove your argument as procedurally legitimate.

Here are some things that you need to be aware of.

1 – Be clear in CX what your affirmative affirms. If you are shady, inconsistent or abusive, you will be punished when debating a debater that is good at winning the argument that you have to be about the resolution. Cross Examination is your pass or your death sentence.

2 – Don't "NO-LINK" out of arguments. You should engage in more "NO INTERNAL LINK" style arguments. Be honest, if people are reading Mead or Bearden, why not go after the part of the argument that says once you link, you cause nuclear war. Every time you set up to answer a negative argument, you must think about how this will interact with topicality.

3 – Be ready to identify debatable negative ground. This is important to a lot of critics. Make sure you identify arguments that most teams are reading on the negative.

4 – Be ready to explain how your interpretation of the topic neither explodes the topic, nor over-limits the topic. This also means you should always have an interpretation of the topic.

5 – If you do not read a plan, be ready to make arguments that would ultimately say "critical ground" is more important than counter-plan ground. You are saying that process style arguments remove discussion away from understanding the issues. The typically "yes we know that, let's do something about it" should not fly here. Your argument needs to be that "action" without true understanding either pacifies our need for real change, or results in negative consequences.

6 – Know the history of debate and you will get by much easier. Back in the early 90's in CEDA some people were reading plans, while others were not. The community was huge then. There were over 300 teams at CEDA Nationals. The diversity of approach in the resolution brought debate to its highest participation numbers. Now the attempt to say we must debate like "X" only takes us back to the days where anyone can qualify for the NDT because we don't have many schools doing NDT debate. Who can NDT merge with next, once the "CEDA style" has phased out? (It won't—Putting the Kin debate)

7 – Have reasons why your method of affirming the resolution is good for debate.

There are some arguments that most teams who read topicality might make. Now many times these will overlap with framework arguments. What you need to do is be ready to debate them and have your answers written down.

You can say it on the negative

There is a topical version of your aff

Extra -Topical

Effects Topical

Gotta have a Plan

A Spec

Discourse is extra-topical

Rules good

Debating about the state good

DEBATING AFFIRMATIVE:

My view of how to debate critically on the affirmative has changed over the years. There were times when I felt like the resolution was just a bad idea, and thought that arguments saying reject the resolution on the affirmative were legitimate. I owe a lot to Shanahan because he and I had some heated arguments about some issues, and one thing I learned is that you should warp the meaning of the topic, rather than say it has the power to shut you out.

NOT ALL CRITICAL AFFIRMATIVES THAT TALK ABOUT OPPRESSION OR DISCRIMINATION ARE PROJECTS!

Be ready to play off of this. This is a common mistake people want to make against K affirmatives, so they can find their “project strategies” from the 1990’s. Yes, some teams used to call their argument a project. But that does not mean you are one.

Remember, when people cannot find direct arguments against you, they will try and control the framing of the debate, and constantly represent you as something you are not. This is one of the biggest challenges as a K debater, especially on the affirmative. You need to control the framing of what you do and what you say, which begins with a good CX and a consistent interpretation of your affirmative.

View of what you can do:

Criticize it/Reject It or The glass ceiling of ideology: This is where people say “the resolution says x” and we don’t want to say that, vote affirmative to reject the resolution.

Poke Fun at it: These types of methods could use satire, irony, metaphors or other methods of attempting to over-identify with the resolution as people might say.

Re-interpret: This is where the best critical debaters find their spot. Once again, you make yourself topical, but at the same time find critical ways to leverage how your interpretation of the topic is normatively better, and use the benefits/advantages from your criticism/affirmative as way to impact turn their interpretation.

Some strategies involve using statements like “The purpose of this debate” or “The framework for this debate is”..... What you do strategically is get ready to go big in the 2nd constructives and rebuttals on why your X statement should be the focus, and taking on the perspective that you will not lose this debate. Then if they don’t debate you there, it’s an easy win. If they do, you should be ready. That is debate.

Common questions/areas of concern you should have when writing a critical affirmative!

Do I read a plan?

Will I link to the statism debate?

Will I be able to compete with the best K debater?

What is my answer to framework?

What is my answer to topicality?

How will I outweigh/frame short-term disads?

Can I identify negative ground?

How will I address counterplans/counter-advocacies?

How will I answer the capitalism kritik?

Cross X is so important for the K debater. You live and die by CX. You can't say you will defend "passage of plan" but then say no link "we don't pass plan" as your first answer to DA's or CP's. (DA – Disadvantage ---- CP – Counterplan)

This brings me to the next thing to consider when reading a Plan, you will have to combat counter-plans. Good policy debaters have a storage closet full of various executive order (XO) counter-plans, states counter-plans, courts counter-plans....so if you read a plan, you have to consider how do I defend against these arguments?

If you choose to read a plan, one strategy is to say that ontology or ethics come first, and if your plan can be legitimated on an ontological level, then you would want to be prepared to argue that this is what is most important i.e., ontology comes 1st. You would claim this debate comes before looking at the impacts of the plan.

Some people try to be critical by reading a plan with critical impacts. One thing to consider is that if you debate the best K teams, you most likely will suffer from your own cognizance of knowing that you link. If you have critical impacts, then an alternative that is K based will probably solve your affirmative impacts better than using the "state" per se.

You have to make those strategic decisions. Figure out where you would like to force the debate. If you would rather have "gotta have a plan" debate than a "CP of the week" debate, then you should not read a plan.

STRATEGIC AFFIRMATIVE THINKING!

When you write your affirmative, taking into consideration the items above is very important. Here are a couple of samples on how to strategically approach your affirmative.

NUKE WAR/EXTINCTION INEVITABLE APPROACH (VOID THE DA IMPACTS)

This type of approach says we are all going to die, so impacts about death are irrelevant. What is most important is X....might it be whiteness/value to life etc...

Then you argue how the securitization/fear of death/nuke war/violence etc.... are rooted in the inability to understand "value to life" or whiteness.....

The strategy here is that if you win their impacts are inevitable, and only by focusing on your affirmative can we address those problems, then the only escape from the "negative" impacts is through the affirmative.

IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF YOUR AFF K STRATEGY

In combination with this approach, you need leverage on how the current "political" or policy-making system fails us in your affirmative area. And that "framing" type of arguments that attempt to exclude certain ideologies perpetuate domination, oppression and imperialism or whatever impacts you choose in your affirmative.

What this does is put you ahead on the evidence side of the debate in the 1ac, rather than forcing the 2ac to read so much evidence. This also gives the 1ar a pre-prepped argument extension. One thing you should do for your affirmative is have your pre-written extensions to key arguments you want in the 2ar vs. negative off case positions, where the 1ar prep for them is short, and precise on things that you may not be ready for. Another important thing to have ready is 1ar extension evidence. Your 2ar prep for extension of evidence should also be done, and this allows you to spend your prep on comparing the important issues. Evidence extensions also help make sure you don't forget an important argument that is made within your evidence that the 2ar consistently extends. You have infinite prep, the question is what do you prep?

The next thing you have to consider with your affirmative is how you will answer other teams Kritik. You're not just going to debate policy teams. This is where the affirmative feels like they have the edge. The negative has the edge in a sense that it gets to choose where to disagree. The affirmative needs to have their permutation evidence ready that says the good/benefits of the affirmative outweigh other critical links/impacts. You must find your "money" permutation evidence. You must also figure out how you will read disadvantages to the alternative of their kritik.

DEBATING NEGATIVE:

If someone gets up and speaks for nine minutes, I can find a place to disagree.

You don't have to agree with everything they say, just find one place to disagree, and have good arguments on why this is the important place to disagree.

Here are some key rules to follow when debating on the negative. When I say rules, I mean good ideas that really do play an important role in winning or losing.

Rule #1 – How does their answer apply to their affirmative?

Example – They read a speaking for others K against you when you read your Kritik in the 1nc. The first thing you must ask your self is how does this apply to the affirmative more?

Rule #2 – Never read a Kritik that has a minimal/speculative link.

Find a concrete place of disagreement.

Rule #3 – Never drop the permutation.

Especially in the 2NR.

Rule #4 – Don't be soft on the voting issues. If they are going to read "X" is a voter on theory arguments, then you should also play this game with many of the absurd arguments they make like "perm do the alt".

Rule #5 – Be clear about what your alternative is in the 1NC and consistent in CX and the 2NR.

Here are some things to consider when working on your negative argument.

First and most important, what are most people saying and how do most people understand "kritiks"? Some high school camps put out the K toolbox. Many college teams have these "toolboxes" also. Analyze those things. One important thing is to understand how people attempt to understand/debate kritiks as though they are mechanical and continuously similar. Some people have generic cards that are tagged "The alternative fails" or "the alternative cedes the political". You must engage the "the alternative" argument that assumes all Kritiks are the same. A good K debater understands they are all infinitely similar, but infinitely different.

When you create a K, many people want to say "Whats the alternative?"...immediately. But this is all situational.

If person X is punching person Y....and you tell person X to stop...it hurts person Y and that's bad....does person X need an alternative "something" to punch, or maybe is just not punching a good idea. Don't overcomplicate arguments. Make them simpler. So now, if my alternative is to just say no to the affirmative, then most of the arguments that people typically make when they are on the affirmative, make no sense. All of the permutation arguments make no sense, because you are rejecting

the affirmative. All of the alternative abusive, moving target arguments make no sense, because your alternative is reject the affirmative. And as stated, you must prove that there is offense in saying no to the affirmative. One good reason, in my mind, is uniqueness, seeing that we must change what we are doing; otherwise the affirmative impacts are inevitable under the current paradigm.

Now to do this, you must come back and ask the question, what makes my argument better than a non-unique disadvantage? This is done through a couple of strategic methods.

This is what I call common points of intersection, where you can stake out a place you are going to disagree, and then be ready to debate why this is important.

Common points of intersection:

The use of the "State".

The representations used to justify the affirmative.

The epistemology or ontology or ethics....

The method of the affirmative in how they debated or intellectually organized their affirmative.

The values or ideologies endorsed by the affirmative case.

The language used by the affirmative.

What you must be ready to debate, is how this point of intersection and disagreement is more important than the advantages of plan that the affirmative might achieve. Some people like to make arguments such as MUST REJECT EVERY INSTANCE. One of the best arguments is something like the George evidence saying EACH ACTION BY THE STATE REIFIES THE STATE. These type of arguments help you transgress past the "non-unique" disadvantage obstacle. I have a couple of observations here. 1st – If the affirmative claims "risk of a link" then you get incremental impacts to your links of your criticism, because they have nullified the roll of uniqueness and threshold arguments. 2nd – Use the argument that the alternative is a move away from the continuation of the problem, which makes the alternative of refusal to engage in acts that reify the ideology the only unique action that can gain traction on a move towards change.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE KRITIK

I think this is one key area of the debate that you must give a lot of attention. I will divide this up into affirmative and negative language. What I want to highlight here is that there are 4 basic debates in every “kritik” debate that you must be involved in when you have those debates. If you’re affirmative, you should organize your frontlines where you are having these 4 basic debates. This also helps the 1ar extensions/line by line in a way that tells the 1ar that there are 4 basic debates. The Language of the K is where you take debate language that people are used to understanding, and integrating your argument into debate. Many people try to be K debaters, and they are saying the same thing, but not in the Language of the K. As much as you want to be true to your “author” or argument, you have to use the language that transgresses your criticism into the debate, or if you’re affirmative you need the language that allows you to compete with the criticism. This becomes very apparent on the permutation debate, where people say the permutation, but never identify the net-benefits to the permutation. A good K debater is very aware of this necessity. As the negative, when people only say “perm”...you need to say that identifying “net-benefits to the permutation in the 1ar are new, and thus illegitimate.

There are 2 components of common critical arguments that I do not include below that need a section of the K debate if they are relevant.

The first is the “Root Cause” debate. This is used by critical debaters to void out the affirmative impacts. If they link to X and X is the root cause of their impacts, then your argument becomes a simple case turn. And even if not a case turn, they still don’t solve if you win this argument. If you’re affirmative, and this is part of their criticism, one DA to the alternative is “root cause focus bad” or since it’s your affirmative, you should be ready to have a root cause debate.

The second is the “impacts inevitable” argument. This is somewhat similar, except sometimes you may want to say “extinction inevitable” or “nuke war inevitable” which allows their impacts to be solely dependent on time frame arguments that cannot be connected to Mead or Bearden, because those authors are too generic. Once again, you can’t spot the affirmative their advantages.

Below are my examples for the language of the kritik. I hear people ask what should my “frontline” look like against a kritik, and I think below you will find that if it is not a necessary component of the “debate” argument, then it is not really worth your time to make the argument. The language of the K is the explanation of how your argument impacts the debate.

NEGATIVE LANGUAGE

The Link Debate

"We have isolated _____ links in this debate. Our evidence for the link debate is _____ and _____."

- "Here is a list of our links. 1.....2.....3....." -

The Impact Debate

"There is no case solvency. We indict their advantages and solvency with our _____ evidence."

"The impact to our links of _____ is demonstrated in our _____ evidence. "

"The impacts of the criticism outweigh the impacts of the affirmative because _____ "

The Permutation Debate

"The permutation fails because it":

- *"does not solve the affirmative because _____"*
- *"does not solve the impact of the criticism because _____"*
- *"there are _____ disadvantages to the permutation. They are1.2."*

The Alternative Debate (If you "solve the aff")

"The alternative is _____."

If true - "The alternative solves the affirmative and there are no disadvantages to the alternative. Any risk of an impact to any of our links means you vote negative."

"The alternative solves the impacts of the criticism because _____."

"There are external impacts that the alternative addresses that that affirmative does not. This is our _____ evidence and they are _____."

If any - "The disads to the alternative do not outweigh the net benefits of the alternative when we consider our _____ links and impacts against the affirmative."

AFFIRMATIVE LANGUAGE

The Link Debate

"Their links are not about us. Their _____ evidence and _____ evidence do not about the affirmative."

"We have isolated _____ link turns in our _____ evidence. Our link turns allow us to access their impacts better than their links."

If true: "The negative links to their own argument in their _____ evidence."

The Impact Debate

"The impacts of the criticism are not based on links to the affirmative because _____."

"The impacts of the affirmative outweigh the impacts of the criticism because _____"

"Only by solving the affirmative impacts can we be able to address the negative impacts because _____"

The Permutation Debate

"The permutation is _____. Our evidence is _____ (read it if 2ac)

"There are _____ net benefits to the permutation. They are 1.....2.....3...."

"The permutation solves the criticism"

"The permutation solves case"

(If 1ar) "We have more permutation evidence__ (read another card)

The Alternative Debate

"The alternative does not solve the affirmative because _____"

"The alternative does not solve for the impacts of the criticism because _____"

If relevant: "The alternative does solve for external net benefits of the criticism"

"We have _____ disadvantages to the alternative. They are 1.....2.....3....."

"The disadvantages to the alternative outweigh the net-benefits of the alternative vs. the affirmative because _____"

THE LINK DEBATE

Never enter a debate with a losing strategy. One key step towards putting a check on such would be to make sure you have a link. In other words, make sure you can find a clear place of disagreement.

THE LINK EVIDENCE

A clear place of disagreement begins with good link evidence. When the year starts, you use generic evidence that provides good examples that match what the affirmatives are doing. But a good and dangerous K debater does not stop there. They then begin to find specific link scenarios with impacts for specific affirmatives. The best link arguments are when your evidence quotes the other teams authors as a link, then you know you're on top of the debate. Being a critical debater is about doing research. This is the way to win the heart of the policy judge who happens to be setting in the back of the room. Show them you research, and don't be a sloppy, utopian K debater. Be real.

Before the debate starts you should take a piece of paper and write links across the top. Begin to number your links along with what evidence you have in the 1nc that is going to connect the affirmative with the critique. If you have one that is dependent on new 2nc link evidence, list those last, and read the evidence as you get to them. Be clear and concise on how many links you have. Muddled debates favor traditional debate styles. The advantage of this is either the 1ar answers all of your link arguments, or they answer none or some, which means you get a clear link.

I call this *The Link Trap*. If you have a link, it doesn't matter how many answers the affirmative makes, you have a link. Your strategy here is to get the 1ar bogged down in denial, going to each link argument trying to win an impossible battle. Technical 1ar's sometimes forget that they can't answer everything. These are arguments you want them to be trying to answer. A good debater is capable of guiding the other team into going for the arguments you know they cannot win.

FRAMING THE OTHER TEAM

This is one of the important parts of being a K debater is your ability to control the framing of the debate. This means turning away all misrepresentations of their arguments and controlling the way their argument should be perceived. This is true on both the affirmative and negative. I talk about it here, because you have to keep the images of the 1ac in perspective as the debate evolves so the other team is still forced to defend what they said in the 1ac, rather than being able to skirt out of their 1ac and defend very minimal positions in the 2ar. They speak last; you have to leave a lasting impression. The 2nr is the hardest speech in the debate, and you should be able to reference the earlier part of the debate to avoid affirmative shape shifting.

This also means you need to have good CX questions and answers to help frame your argument and their argument. When you speak, talk to the other team, don't talk to the judge. Refer to things as "your authors" and "your rhetoric". Any mis-framing of you should always be cleared up in CX.

IMPACT DEBATE

This part of the debate becomes important from a meta-abstract perspective. Does your argument even compete with the affirmative? If you are trying to just straight up outweigh the affirmative, then you need to have a strategic aspect to your argument such as: must always reject or value to life outweighs risk of war or each action reifies the Kritik. Most judges will think some action is always good, unless you can demonstrate your argument on a few levels.

The first level is the denial of solvency. Built into your criticism should be arguments that the affirmative does not solve, that their literature/knowledge base is flawed. Then you must deny the internal links to their arguments.

Then you need to engage in how the affirmative makes things worse, the case turn portion of your argument.

The next level is where you attempt to engage in why this place you disagree is important. You should be ready to have an extensive debate about why their _____ is important to their politics and the outcome of their plan.

-Ethics first/Ontology first/Value to Life first

As you can see, if you win your off-case, then you should be protected from most of what the 1ac has to say. This is why some teams choose to only read 1 Off, and never go to case. It really depends on what you want to do. Sometimes you need a case debate because you can read many other independent criticisms of the affirmative that are not tied to your larger off case position.

Do not allow your impact evidence to make the problem/impact seem inevitable or unsolvable. What you would like to do is impact your argument as the root or as key to the impacts of their arguments i.e., Root of all violence – Root of all oppression –

This way you can get a no solvency and a case turn if you have a link. You are doing just like the policy teams, when you say try or die, but in this instance its change our “framework” or die. In other words, if we continue to enact policy through the dominant paradigm, then we will all die or most will suffer and die, while some live.

It's also good to have an impact that says we should avoid each and every instance. This is best represented by the Barndt debate, on “Must reject every instance of racism”. Lay it out in the 2nc as an independent impact, and see how they deal with it. 1ar fumble means you have an easy impact that outweighs the affirmative. If you get good at it, it doesn't matter what the 1ar does.

THE PERMUTATION

Remember in the beginning where I said a key strategy for speaking first is to prove the other team never disagreed with you. In competitive debate we call this the permutation

WHEN YOU'RE AFFIRMATIVE

As you can see, most of what I have written is based on being negative. If you're affirmative the permutation can also be a tool for you. Many people write their affirmatives so as to not take an absolute stance on something, or say very little, and that then allows them to say, "yeah, that too". As the affirmative, you want to have some clutch permutation strategies that are designed to say either it is okay to have a little bad within your politics and we shouldn't reject politics based on their lack of perfection. There is a book called Identity/Difference that gets to some of these issues. You need permutation evidence, and it would be nice to have extension evidence for the 1ar. Another important thing to utilize is the language of debate. Identify and explain the net benefits to the permutation in the 2ac. Don't just throw the word around, but use it to strategically engage proving that your arguments do not disagree to a level that would justify voting against the affirmative. The critic really wants to know the net benefits vs. the disadvantages to the permutation.

WHEN YOU'RE NEGATIVE

This seems to have become a silver bullet against debate arguments that do not seem process oriented. My problem with the "permutation" is people act like arguments are a machine, and if I remove the battery it won't run... The perm is like the battery. An argument is not like a machine, and I hope you learn to debate outside of the Cartesian paradigm. This means that there is no one singular four letters or word that should be able to eliminate an entire argument with many diverse links and impacts. You as the debater need to be able to take on the permutation. One strategy some people have employed is to let the 1nr take the permutation, and spend the whole time on it if needed. I encourage you to set some standards for what you think a permutation can be, and how it should function. You cannot just write off all permutations as bad, because when two teams that are more K oriented debate each other, this is really the only debate to be had many times.

Here is your trick. You want to force the 1ar into deciding; do I go for the no link arguments, or the permutation? A good block means the 1ar cannot answer all of your identified links you list in the 2nc and all of your permutation evidence and arguments. As you strengthen your links, you're creating disadvantages to the permutation. As you strengthen your permutation, you should be adding more links. If they just go for no link arguments, you will still beat them with your permutation arguments that are also links and impacts.

- Answer the specific perm – Don't just group them or read a big overview. Just like you shouldn't be able to apply one perm to your argument, you shouldn't be able to apply one generic "perm" block against all perms.

- Use the whole 1nr if necessary – Make sure you force the 1ar into a strategic decision on this.
- Use the language of debate – what are the advantages and disadvantages of perm
- Have them write out all permutations
- Don't drop **any** permutation **ever**
- Your links are your disadvantages to the perm – if you had no link then the perm would make sense.

Here are some examples of how people would make these arguments. Whenever they use one-liners like the ones below, a word that is neither a claim or a warrant, you need to have a way to apply the “makes no sense DA”. People are handed blocks where the words are written on there, but never provide an explanation. I see these as illegitimate and so do most critics as long as you identify them as such. When I said set standards above, I mean do something like say:

The permutation has 3 requirements to be legitimate.

1. Must say what the permutation is.
2. Must have a claim and a warrant
3. Must have net benefits identified by the 2ac – 1ar sandbagging is abusive.

Then you can apply this argument to all of their permutations that are not arguments.

SAMPLES:

Perm -

Perm do both -

Perm do the alt -

Arguments like “perm do the alt” make no sense. You need you be able to say, “the alternative is reject the affirmative”grant this argument....vote negative...not a reason to vote affirmative...no net benefit identified. Additionally, this severs the advocacy of the 1ac and I have discussed earlier why the affirmative must be accountable for the speech acts of the 1ac.

Perm do the plan then the alt – This argument misunderstands what a K is and probably what an argument is to be honest. If you have any links into why the affirmative is bad, then it makes no sense to do this. Also, if you have an alternative that solves the affirmative impacts argument, then there is no reason to risk the links. This is also no different than a time-frame permutation and functions like your regular policy debate time-frame permutation.

And that justifies perm do the alt – You have to watch out for this popping up in the 1ar. The 2ac will say alt is abusive in some way, and then the 1ar will spin this argument to say the tag above. 2nr needs to be ready.

Every other instance perm – This argument made sense when people were using abusive alternatives that said “we should all love each other” as I demonstrated earlier. This is based on the idea, that if we all loved each other, then we could do the plan and the alternative of love would keep any of the impacts from occurring. The solvency for the alternative overwhelms the links to the kritik is the basis of this argument. Once again, if your alt is not a utopian alt, then you are debating about the politics of the 1ac, and thus all we are only talking about the instance of the 1ac. Also, this permutation is a “utopian permutation”. I think K debaters need “utopian permutations bad” arguments, but if they say utopian alternatives are bad, and you don’t have a utopian alternative, then all of those arguments and impacts apply to the affirmatives utopian permutation.

Time Frame Perm – Discussed above. They never allow for a true test of competition. These permutations made sense in a policy world where some disadvantages were time based like elections, but that is not true in all instances, and rarely in most instances.

Footnote perm – Could say 2 things. Perm – footnote the affirmative or that their permutation footnotes the affirmative. I am not sure why this tests the competition of the two arguments, but you need to figure out what you would say if someone attempted to do this.

Strikethrough perm – Erasure might be good word here also. This has been a product of Derrida. The reason would be to not forget the baggage that has come along with the word.

Juxtaposition perm – Use the affirmative to juxtapose with the criticism as one way of understanding the world. (sample) – There are different ways people use this argument. Some people use it to say your criticism is impossible without my affirmative. I see it as more like my criticism isn’t necessary absent your affirmative. This does not seem to be a reason why the affirmative should win or the criticism should be ignored, unless you mishandle the argument, or worst case, don’t answer it.

Perm do the plan and the alternative in other instances – I have not concluded why this makes sense yet. This is a common argument made, and does make sense to some people. It is a plan plus type of permutation which captures all the net benefits of your alternative. But, if you have links, they never access your alternative and if your alternative is to reject the affirmative, then it really makes no sense. But, many policy teams make this type of argument no matter what the alternative would be. If it’s a “Critique” then some people assume all of their typical policy style arguments apply. Your links are your shield against this argument.

Many of the permutations made by most teams do not focus on removing their links to the affirmative, but are more oriented towards making assumptions about the alternative. Be aware of this. When you decide how you will deploy your alternative, you must consider how it will function in the world of permutations.

THE ALTERNATIVE:

I had a discussion earlier about the concept of the alternative in debate. There are instances where you might need an alternative. However, I want to say that some people who want the “kritik” to be viewed as outlandish, teach you to use the Kritik with those alternatives that assume you can fiat mindset shifts. I say don’t do it. When I say use a reject the affirmative type alternative, here is an example:

*The alt is to refuse the politics of the 1AC - this political act is key to exposing the fissures of dominant ideology which is the most productive method of dissent
burke 2007*

In the case of sexist/racists/homophobic language, sometimes the alternative is needed if you want people to have a different word to describe their world. There are also instances where alternative frameworks exist to address certain issues or concerns. Many times this is literature dependent. There was a time that whenever you said you had an idea for a K, someone would say “what’s the alternative?” ... There are some interesting ways of thinking about this notion of alternative. Sometimes its good to just say, “don’t do it”...Other times though, there needs to be another option, or things will continue to be done the only way that people know how...This is where you need to be doing your research. Campbell had an interesting argument claiming that we must stop or breakthrough or out of the current framework or paradigm if we can ever find the space to see other alternatives. Right now, dominant modes of thinking prevent the discovery of newly possible alternatives. So the alternative question is secondary to the primary need of escaping a dominant paradigm. In many debates you will have to feel out how you want to frame the alternative. If it’s a team that gives you the leeway to read the alternative like a counter-plan, then play with it. But remember, if you want a solid argument; just fulfill the 4 levels of argument discussed earlier:

- a. Your literature is bad/your theories/schools of thought etc.
- b. You don’t solve – a better K has a Kritik of the idea of “solvency”
- c. You make things worse/Impacts inevitable absent “alt”
- d. This is the most important thing in this debate i.e., impact calculus

Then, it doesn’t matter how your theory arguments get interpreted. From this, I want you to see how getting to play in the world of “alternatives” is only another avenue for you to be able to seal the debate more easily by playing off of their bad understanding of critical arguments. Make sure you get A-D locked down, and winning an alternative type argument below is just bonus shots at winning.

ALTERNATIVES THAT "SOLVE" THE AFFIRMATIVE

One simple overview to lay out in the 2NC is one that allows the critic to see the debate from a meta-level. Like:

The alternative solves the affirmative – This is our _____ evidence in the 1nc.

There are no disadvantages to the alternative, any risk of a link to any of our impacts means you would vote negative.

When you run this type of alternative, this is where you want to situate yourself in the debate round.

A - They did not deny you could solve their affirmative advantages. (like a CP)

B - They did not read any disadvantages to the alternative. (IE – no offense against the CP)

Any policy judge can understand this argument, and see why at a meta-level the affirmative cannot win if they did not deny those two claims.

There are theoretical issues with how you frame your alternative that you should consider when taking this approach. Some examples include the idea that you fiat everyone's attitudes, or that you defend X as your alternative, but then say it eventually solves the affirmative. You really are depending on the other team letting their guard down on those theory arguments to get your alternative to function in the debate. I challenge you to make debate "make sense". Don't let it be some fantasy world where arguments become ungrounded. Be the grounded debater. Keep things simple!

ALTERNATIVES THAT INCLUDE THE "PLAN"

This type of alternative has to do with having something like a critique of language or representations that were used in the 1ac. Your argument would be that we should support the affirmative plan, without the 1ac representations. This would be the 1nc and 2nc alternative. Some people have referred to this as a floating pic. I think it is a good way to show the politics of the 1ac was bad. One problem with this type of strategy is when the 2ac stands up and reads add-on advantages of representations that are good that you do not have a representation/language K against, and thus plan has more advantages than your alternative without the representations. Sometimes this makes sense, other times it's hard to understand. Sometimes it's okay to push the barriers and see what you can get away with. Especially if you know that you will turn the affirmative with your argument without them accessing their advantages, then you can try other ways to seal the debate.

ALTERNATIVES THAT “REJECT” THE AFFIRMATIVE

These are my favorite because you escape the theory arguments that people have created in response to bad critique debate. Think of it this way, if someone stood up and said we are all going to die, and then convinced us of this. Their next move was to offer a solution. We look at it and decide, nah, it won't actually solve. Would the senators just go home and get ready to die? No, they would come back another day, with another idea; most likely tomorrow, and not with the affirmative plan. So it's never try or die. If you needed an alternative it might be good to say we could view X from X framework as opposed to the one used by this plan, but that's not really needed. Try or die assumes people throw their up their hands and give up. By saying reject the plan, you're not saying let's all give up. You're saying not this affirmative in hopes that another “senator” will find a better way to address the problem. The fallback to try or die should also help you if you have some “post-plan” impacts. Roll-forward policies. You know, 2ac says we don't solve, we might decrease a risk, means that affirmative loses control over how/who./what methods will be used to address this concern that they have elevated to extinction. If the status quo is violent, then the affirmative opens the door for any action necessary that is not their plan to address the impacts they identify. If people want to be policy makers, then be real. Politics of extinction is dangerous. You need a strategy to play off of this.

ALTERNATIVE THEORY ARGUMENTS

There are a couple of theory arguments you should be able to dispel immediately when they are made.

Alternative is moving target – If you have a clear cross-x and have a consistent place where you discuss the alternative and the way you describe the alternative never changes, you should be fine.

Alternative is Utopian – This makes sense in some instances where alternatives are something of the amorphous “we should all love each other” or “everyone should embrace a theory of non-violence”. This is not going to happen. There is no way it can happen. You must position your alternative against the affirmative plan.

Alternative fiats mindset shifts – This argument is similar to the last one. In cross-x/policy debate we have a somewhat “social contract” that we debate the resolutions and pretend the policy is passed. Though all of this is debatable as far as why we have “fiat” and is it even necessary, the key thing to realize is that you truly should not try and fiat a mindset shift for anyone beyond those whom you are trying to persuade. What I mean is that the revolutionary energy it takes to get real change gets undermined by ideas that are too far out there to possibly be true. People start taking important ideas less seriously because they were portrayed in such impossible ways.

DEBATING CRITICAL TEAMS

It is so interesting to see people try to comprehend how to debate other critical teams. There have been teams that talk about how they will disagree before the debate, and then have a debate from that point. There is always a place to disagree. If you stand up for nine minutes and speak, I will always find a place to disagree. Then I need a debate on why that place of disagreement is important. So how do you debate K teams? You engage the literature. If you're affirmative, you most likely will be going for a permutation. If you are negative, then you need to do good research against the arguments their authors are making. Within all of the K literature mostly, there are debates about the issues being discussed. You can't run from researching the other team, you need to take them up on their argument. A good example is Nietzsche. If you read one of the many Nietzsche arguments on the negative, you know that many critical authors take some of what they learn from Nietzsche. It is almost unavoidable in academia. What you have to do is find the literature where the discussions occur. If your affirmative, you might want some of those arguments about how your author is Nietzschean, to make the permutation argument. Many of these debates are really decided by who has done the best research. That is displayed by does the negative team really have a link or not. If the negative gets a link, usually the affirmative will lose. It is funny reading the online discussions about debating against critical affirmatives, and most people really assume a critical affirmative is only griping about debate, or never has any political value. As a critical debater, you have to give the critical affirmatives some respect, but come to understand that these are new styles of debates, and the methods can change. If they don't have to be topical, and you give them the ground to not read a plan, then you need to have a good defense of why the permutations should be evaluated differently. You don't have to disagree with everything they say, just find one place. Remember that. If you are affirmative, then you get to pretty much cheat as much as you want with your 1ac, as long as you are ready to defend what you do. A good K team will have a framework style argument that says debate good, so be careful. But if you're debating a team that never reads T or framework, why read a plan and give them links? Think about some of these things. At the same time, why are you not always debating this way? (without a plan) As stated above, the best advice is to do your research and prepare. Engage their argument. Have some disadvantages to their alternative ready, if they offer one. Everything I have said above about finding a place to disagree and proving why that is important applies to debating everyone. That is debate. When people try to think of a critical affirmative as anything more than an argument, they misunderstand what the argument really says. There will be another edition of the critical debaters handbook that includes a more in depth discussion on debating other teams reading more critical arguments that talks about specific types of affirmatives. The following discussion on praxis etc. will actually give more insight on how to debate "critical" teams.

METHOD/PRAXIS/FORM AND CONTENT:

I feel like this is a place where people can really find how to best express themselves. Take the personal test. Give a 9 minute speech any way you want about anything you want. Have your 5 best friends listen to you. Maybe they are not debaters. Purpose: Find out how to best express yourself. Some people are great story tellers, others are poets. Challenge the norms of debate that say you have to speak a certain way to debate. There is no one definition of debate. Debate really is what we make it. Now, to succeed, you need to understand where some of the conventions in debate come from. When I say understand, I mean really attempt to ascertain why things have become the way that they are.

One example is how do we make this event “objective”. It is hard for people to participate in a “competitive” event, if the winner is determined subjectively. This becomes a lot of people’s complaint against non-evidence forms of debate. Besides just speaking and persuading, something should be added to make people engage in research, and have support for their arguments. So then, like a court of law, we have evidence. Like a court of law, we have cross-examination. Like a court of law, we brought in terms like “presumption”. Evidence became a deciding factor, but there was also this problem of argument responsibility. If I make an argument, then you should have the responsibility to answer, otherwise I would be right. Because if that were not the standard, and we only evaluate your arguments based upon if I answer them or not, then I would selectively only “answer” your worst arguments. So then came the burden of rejoinder. Along with this idea, came the idea that silence is consent. Like law, if I sue someone and they do not reply, then their silence is a granting of the argument. From this perspective, the speed of debates began to incrementally climb. Speed has been used in debate for strategic purposes since at least the mid 70’s. Now, we are talking 40 years of fast information processing. This amount of time is easily long enough where trends can be set of people perfecting this form of debate. If you understand how we got to our fast technical debates, then you can better understand how to deconstruct them. So debaters started going fast, and judges started to be divided up into those who can “flow” and those who cannot “flow”. The debaters, who were fast, and technical, and had a lot of evidence to match their speed, started to become the more dominant. As one’s dominance in an event grows, you would have less desire for that event to change. So then we get the many norms of debate that exist today. Yes, we do a lot of things because of the nature of the activity, but its best to try to understand why!

As debaters go faster and faster their persuasive skills are reduced more and more. Judges are treated like information processors, and the ability to vote against things you disagree with is more possible in a world where your rules for the “flow” and standards of required evidence were the simple deciding factors of who wins or loses, not really how much the person actually believed the argument. It really was a move to try and be the most fair/objective decision maker. As a debater you must recognize this. There are reasons for the conventions, but is now the time to break

down those conventions? Since most people do it, if you get good at breaking it down, you should have measure of success.

One thing that becomes clear when you debate differently, is people are looking for some way to pigeon hole you or frame you into a certain argument so they can access specific pieces of evidence. You should think about how calling you something you are not might have some impacts to it. You should also be aware that you must have an argument. No matter how you say it, you must be able to contextualize a debate argument from what you are saying. Many teams will never hear your argument, and only play off of your method, rather than your argument. Some people say you should have a methodology debate, saying your method is good. I don't think you should do something, then read someone else saying it can do a certain thing. Its good have a defense, but if you do it well, you don't need methodology cards. Policy debaters don't always read evidence saying their methodology is good, so I am not sure why it's an alternative style debater's burden.

Not to steal from Nike, but just do it. Don't say debate prevents X, or does X, debate the way you want to debate, and then when they say you cannot debate that way, that your type of debate should be excluded, you turn on the offense and let them have it. In this instance, you are the alternative. You embody and debate like it. That is why I say debate is what we make it.

SPEED:

Speed kills. It wins debates, and it loses debates. For many people this is the tool that helps them win debates. Make more arguments than the other team is able to answer. For many people this type of debate is fun. When you have a judge and an opponent that really likes this kind of debate, people have fun. However, there becomes a time when "speed" becomes dangerous. This happens when you lose control over your content, get consumed in breadth of arguments and lose sight of the simple manifestation of debate: Where do we disagree and why is that important! As a debater, it is nice if you have the speed to battle any team, and never have the concern of someone making more arguments than you can answer. However, some people allow this desire to go fast over-consume them into making as many bad arguments as they do good arguments. The speed of the debate has 2 variables. The first is the actual rate of speaking, and number of arguments the debaters are making. The second variable is where the alternative debater wants to be. This is the variable of limiting the debate to in depth 2 or 3 arguments, while allowing yourself to discount most other arguments strategically. When you get ready to say why this is an important place to disagree, you want to be deep. Then you can filter through their arguments that are not applicable to this debate, and thus control the speed of the debate.

I have 2 key tips here:

My first area of advice on speaking and speed is never breach the point of incomprehensibility. Nobody likes it. Find the place where you can go fast but do not over do it.

My second area of advice is to go slow enough where the critic can comprehend and understand each and every card you read. You want them to be with you as you put the round together. Some arguments are too in-depth for some people to pick up the evidence after the round and understand. You need to be teaching/explaining your argument as the debate is happening.

There are people that read the so-called “speed” kritik. I want to defend it, but I also want to discourage it. I will defend it because it privileges students who can receive the best education and have the money to attend long institutes with training in the techne of debate. When we have students who spend much of their education in schools where security is somehow elevated over education, to tell them they have to be able to pick something up and read it quickly to be able to play debate, many students would rather quit debate than tell someone that can’t read very well. There is a true impact of exclusion involved when we say “that is what debate is”. This might also explain the demographics of who are elite champions in college and high school debate. Not all the time, but most of the time. I have seen students walk away from debate for these reasons. Students from all races, sexes, classes and genders. So there is a good argument as to why speed is bad for debate.

But here is how I want to discourage it. This is where I say you should capitalize on it by utilizing non-speed to your advantage. Do you really think that judges/critics are not vulnerable to persuasion? So look at debate this way. There are a series of ties you need to attend to for the purposes of winning a debate. The first one is being able to touch all of their arguments. This means that you have to, in some way, take their arguments into consideration. There is grouping, and there is focus or simplifying the debates. I will explain this on the “flow/game-board” discussion. The second one is actually extending your evidence and answering theirs, while comparing the two. The debater that compares their “evidence” to the other teams is ahead of the debater who only extends their evidence and/or answers the other teams. Then if both teams do such, we have the “debate after the debate”. This is where the critics read their evidence. I feel like this is where a good team should win most of their debates. If you lose the debate after the debate, then you need to go back and do more research. This also means if you are really good, you know which cards to have in the critic’s hands at the end of the debate, and you have already told them how they can take the most of the other teams evidence, and still not be able to overcome your quality evidence.

Then, if you have had the ability, include moments of persuasion in your argument. Believe me, debate critics are bored of the same old same old, and if you bring something new and are good at it, all you have to do is take note of the conventions of debate that are hard for people to break out of, and try to just tie the other team. The team who went the slowest probably had better moments of persuasion and connected with a critics or critics, acknowledging that humans can never be blank slates. (Debatable I know)

FLOW/GAME-BOARD:

I like to refer to this as the game-board. This is really the critic's form of record keeping. Once again, to try and go through the steps or hurdles of how most people judge debates. You can't win if you can't draw a game-board. You need to know how it's done. It is an uphill battle to win without knowing how most debate critics function in formulating their decision. Why do they do it? To make sure we fulfill a burden of rejoinder. You need to fulfill a minimum BOR. Learn how to draw a game-board first, and see how decisions are made before you decide to play debate completely off the game-board. You have to see how people normally understand debate. Is flowing hard? Yep, but get this. There have been thousands of people who think they can "take notes" on their flow, and don't see that it is one component of peoples desire to have an objective activity that makes sinking 100 hours a week of work into. You have to respect that.

So here is a way to view the game-board. You really need to be able to attend to "voting issues" and "evidence". That should be your priority. When your negative, you can somewhat control the amount of game-board breadth by reading one off case and then having some case arguments. This makes the debate about 2 game-boards; the 1ac game-board and the 1 off case game-board. The 2ac would then have a list of arguments already prepared against the "off case" game-board. The difference between off case and case arguments can be explained like this. The 1ac speaks and so they have created the first game-board. If you want to flow each advantage separately, then you would have however many game-boards you create dividing up the 1ac. For my sample:

Advantage I (Game-board 1)

Solvency (Game-board 2)

Then the 1nc speaks. If they have arguments about advantage I, they would make those on that game-board. Say we have three.

1.

2.

3.....

Then you have solvency arguments on the second game-board.

1.

2.....

Then you have one meta position we will call the "off case" argument. When you say "off case" you are saying you want a new game-board for the critic to track this debate.

YOU DO NOT SAY I HAVE 2 OFF CASE and 4 ON CASE.

Your roadmap should say 2 Off case, and then identify which game-board you would like to discuss from the 1ac. It's okay to not refute all of the 1ac, so be specific on which game-board you want the critic to be writing. Then when anyone is going to refer to those arguments, they take everyone to that game-board. The 2ac would then lay out their "frontlines" to the "off case" based upon their pre-prepped arguments against this position. If they have 12 answers, then the negative team has to figure out some way to take those 12 answers into consideration. The 2ac would then go to each of the 1ac game-boards, and talk about those arguments in order of – 1. 2. 3.....just as the 1nc has laid them out. If a speaker is speaking, write what they say in the order they say it. Pretty simple.

There can be a deeper discussion on this with in another volume, my point is you have to take into account why and how the norm exists if you want to disrupt/overcome it.

Now there are strategies as to why you would want to disrupt the flow in a debate. If you feel like there are only a few simple arguments you need to win to win the debate, then you should just lay out those arguments in order, providing reasons how each arguments answers each off case. So the 2ac says, no order, or new sheet of paper. The strategy here is that the 2n and the 1n have divided up game-boards already, and their trained way of extending arguments assumes that you go to each game-board, and isolate each debate, but if you just make arguments and then say how they answer each off case, the negative block is not sure how to proceed when you do not split up the game-boards.. The 1ar just has to extend the 2ac arguments in order, while answering the so-called dropped arguments that the negative will extend.

There are a few important things I want to express about the game-board. One is to learn how to carve your key arguments into the game-board that are about where you disagree and why that is important. I mean be very clear, "we will have the value to life debate here". It is much better to offer up a key battle and see if they take you up on it, then try and be sneaky and hope they don't catch it. You want to beat them with this argument, so be very clear where you are having key debates. Some people call this frontloading your arguments.

Debate above the flow: What I mean by this is that at some point in the debate, the evidence has been laid out and many arguments are not truly about the place where you might disagree. Be the debater that can step up above the "extend/yes/no" and actually do the "evidence" comparison from actually reading both teams evidence, then you have a better chance of success. Step out of the muck, and really highlight the key arguments and evidence.

Now as a judge, I can tell when a debater is not actually using a game-board because they spend most of their prep time shuffling through files or evidence and not actually writing on your game-board. You should always be writing on your game-board or writing on pages that you will insert into the game-board. This is one of the first things you need to learn as a debater when using the game-board.

WHAT IS EVIDENCE?

I am not one to think that evidence is one particular thing. In debate, it means what do you have to support your argument beyond opinion. There are many different types of evidence. Obviously your traditional form of evidence such as magazine articles and books are important. But then there are the non-traditional forms of evidence - Clips from well known speakers; parts of a movie that help to make a particular argument; Song lyrics and videos. Does it really take a lot to be more qualified than a New York Times staff writer or even a RAND institute think tank? I like to think of evidence as reference for support. A lot of people think you need to read "evidence" saying its okay to use this as "evidence" in debate. I am not really part of this school of thought. I think you should just do it how you want, and if you're good enough, it served the purpose you intended. I think you always want to have some form of traditional evidence available in the debate so you can compete in the debate after the debate. If judges hear a debate, wait 30 minutes reading evidence of the other teams, and you had non-traditional forms that don't put anything in their hands to refresh their memory, you are going to have a hard time winning elimination rounds when there are audiences and multiple judges because your ideas/arguments get lost in the debate after the debate. So at least have something for them at the end of the round.

USE OF EVIDENCE:

We used to read the whole sentence in debate, back last millennium. Now it seems you can selectively underline some words that say your argument most directly, often leading to shallow readings out loud of very deep arguments, where much context was left out. Include the context if you underline/highlight. You need to decide if you are going to read evidence, reference it, merely paraphrase it. There are good reasons to do any of these. You need to figure out your style, taking the above into consideration. If you do it differently, its interesting to see what other teams responses are. You need good "evidence" for your argument, and you need to get good at reading it, extending it, and then explaining it and applying it. My rule is never read a bad piece of evidence. The debates with 3-5 great pieces of evidence are much better than the one with 50 pieces of bad evidence. Reading bad evidence effects your reputation when judges read them after the debate and wastes your time during your speech while reading it. And if its bad, it does not take a good debater long to answer it. Actually most will ignore it, hoping you go for it, knowing that this argument can't hurt them.

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER IN THE ROUND

CROSS-EXAMINATION:

I feel that to be a good critical debater, you must learn how to be effective in CX. This is where you can make up ground on arguments that you feel can be dismissed. A good cross-x begins with reclaiming control of the framing of the debate. If they have framed you as a “performance” or a “project” only because your argument involved some personal politics, you need to immediately make it clear that those are not about you. There are 2 areas of the debate you need to work on in CX.

The first area is where you disagree. If you are affirmative, then you want to hedge back on their most important arguments first, this would be framework or topicality. If it is a critical debate, you want to investigate the links, because you most likely will be going for no-link/perm. If you’re negative you want to seal off obvious links that can be ascertained from their speech.

The second area of the debate you need to investigate is the why is this important part of the debate. As the affirmative, you need to be able to argue that their place of disagreement is a bad place to disagree, or that you access those arguments better. On the negative you need to be able to make sure, 100%, you hedge against any attempts to argue about the point of disagreement, and its importance.

Sometimes you need to utilize cross-x to fill in your game-board. You cannot win consistently without a complete game-board.

How many topicality violations are there?

Can you write out all permutations?

When you are negative always ask for the permutations to be written out and identified in cross-x.

Can you write out your alternative text?

This is important when you are affirmative and debate against another critical team. Don’t allow them to get away with misworded alternatives that do not compete with the affirmative. Any alternative that is either not your literature base style alternative or straight up rejection of your politics, you have room to capture it through the permutation. Have the other team write it out for you.

Control the Framing the Debate:

As stated earlier, many of your losses debating differently will come from people being able to frame you as something you are not, and you never escape such enframing. You need to make sure that you eliminate any misunderstanding about how they frame you, and continuously refer to the other team as you make your argument.

Here are some really basic tips from one of the best CXers I have ever seen in action.

- Preparation
- Direction
- Control
- Avoid big open ended questions
- Ask questions
- Make an Impression
- Should know CX strategy before round begins
- Against soft left Affs, we need to win a RC argument
- Make sure you make a mark
- The way you answer or ask questions is important
- Questions should be sneaky
- Answer should be totally open and honest
- Showboat
- Don't be the unliked one/rude one
- Get the last word

WHAT IS AN OVERVIEW!

I remember when we used overviews as our “thesis explanation” of our argument. I want to offer a different way of seeing the overview. When you give the 2a or the 2n, you want to give an overview that does 2 things: A - Locks the debate down into a debate about the place you disagree. B - Get the main pillars of your argument into the debate if they have not all made it into the debate. Write your tags out longer to explain your argument as you’re giving your speech, and thus the old school “thesis” overview is not needed. Then your overview is about debate arguments, rather than the story of the author/argument you chose.

2NC Sample:

A - Colonialism is the root cause of your affirmative impacts.

---extend 1nc evidence

I have more evidence (.....)

B. Your affirmative is a colonial act, which means you only make your 1ac harms worse.

--extend 1nc evidence

I have more evidence (....)

C. Must reject acts of colonialism in those instances to ever find a world of decolonization.

----Evidence-----

This is a way to say, here are the key arguments, and this is what the debate is about. Then you spend the rest of your speech, managing the information in a way that gets you to the tie.

The affirmative sample would not be much different. You would highlight the key arguments that you think will address most/or all of their arguments.

Overviews are not necessary, but can be effective tools for bringing the debate to one place on the game-board into a kind of winner-take-all debate. One important thing to remember is that if the 2a gives an overview, the neg block should answer it. If the 2nc gives an overview, the 1ar must go answer it.

BEING PREPARED ON THE KEY ARGUMENTS

This is one place that you must be ready for before you go to the tournament. My example for this debate would be a Spanos or Heidegger or Dillon type argument. The argument would be that to really understand the impacts of our plan of action, we must investigate the ontology behind such action. Now if this is going to be your affirmative argument or negative argument, you know that this will be important in the debate. So what you do is think of what you want to say in the final speech on this issue. How can you best say "Ontology comes first" with the evidence you have.

Go to the 1st speech. Insert some of your cards here. Insert the cards that make the basic argument. On the affirmative you have the 1ac, the 2ac and the 1ar where you can read evidence. So a good distribution would be 2 in the 1ac, 2 in the 2ac and 1 in the 1ar. So what are your five best pieces of evidence? Lay them out, and pick which speech you want them in. Then after you get your 1ac done, prepare your 2ac that extends the 1ac cards on this issue, and then reads 2 more. After your 2ac is prepped on "Ontology comes first" you go and prep the 1ar. This means an extension of all 4 pieces of evidence read and one new piece of evidence. Then you are setting up for the 2ar extension of the 5 cards that really make your argument the best. Obviously you will hear the Owen card in response to your ontology argument, so go ahead and prep answers to Owen and any of the other very few ontology arguments you might hear. Have a 2ar insert that answers Owen. As you can see, now you're ready to focus your speeches on the other team's evidence, because you already have your game plan laid out on how you will have the "Ontology Comes first debate".

On the negative you do the same thing, except you only get 2 speeches to read evidence rather than 3. The 2NR should have their best rhetorical explanation of why "Ontology Comes First" that includes and extension of the key pieces of evidence they might need in this debate. What I want you to get is that if you have your stuff ready, then you really do spend your prep looking at their evidence and figuring out how you can win the evidence comparison battle.

BEING A GOOD EVEN/IF DEBATER!

The best debaters know that they cannot win every argument in every debate. What you need to do is be able to explain why you win, even if the other team wins all of their arguments. Here is what I mean. If the critic can take all of the evidence from the debate, read it, and then your explanation of why you win is able to navigate through the evidence and still suffice, that is how you win debates. You need to tell the critic exactly what to tell the other team on why they lose in as simple terms as you can. If you read every piece of evidence in the debate as it is being read, then you can make such an assessment. It's easy for a critic to say that their evidence said what they wanted, but that doesn't win the debate, then to say "your evidence does not say that" when it usually does. If both pieces of evidence support each side of a claim very well, you need to offer them the way out. Even if they win this argument, we win because...

CHIT-CHAT

No, this does not mean you should be a schmoozer before the debate with the judge, nor does it mean try to make small talk with the critic. What this means is that you need to have a connection with the critic during the round that involves much more than your brief moments of speaking. From the time you walk in the room until the round is over, you need to be watching the critic in a way where every time they look up in the debate, they see your eyes. Every non-verbal gesture they make towards arguments, you see, and every time the other team makes a bad argument you should make eye contact with the critic as they recognize also the other team made a bad argument. There is power in this, especially if the other team does not notice, and continues to try and extend such argument. This means you need to set up where you can see the critic and the other team at the same time. Do not put things in front of you, and get everything out of the way except what you need. Look organized. **BOTTOM LINE:** In many debates it becomes a tie for many judges.

Debate judges are smart and most are also former debaters. In most debates they could vote either way. You must ask yourself what causes a critic to step one way or the other. What causes them to accept some things the other team says and deny some things I have said? You need to investigate all of your interactions in a debate to make sure none of them result in the critic not liking something you do. What cause them to step to the other team? You want to be the one that the critic steps to in a tie. I think this handbook helps get you going the right way. Be grounded as a debater. Have your arguments make sense. If they don't make sense to you, how can they make sense to others? Don't be language dependent. Be able to say your argument with the common debate terms. Yes it is good to use the language of debate some, but don't make it a crutch that is supposed to fill in the gaps of when your argument makes no sense. This happens a lot in debate, and you should want to be the smart debater in the round, rather than the out of control, say anything style of debater. The critic creates an image of you and then a liking or disliking the moment they walk in the room and see you the first time. Then if they judge you again, that image is built upon. Start out looking like a debater!

In debate we like to do name dropping, so I want to drop some names of some people that you would like to see in the back of the room if you are a critical debater. Yes, I will leave many of my friends out, which only means I saved you the trouble of being quoted in a debate round. This does not mean they will vote for you, obviously, but that this style of debate can connect with them.....(I left out first names or last names so they could deny agreeing with me if needed)

Johnson, Giglio, Watts, Cleary, Odekirk, Dunn, Kuswa, Baxter-Kauf, Miller, Murillo, Russell, Weitz, Green, SJ, Durham, Taylor, Dennis, Haddad, Peterson, Cooper, Mabry, PJ, Ritchie, Register, Guevera, Hester, Albaniak, Vince, Buntin, Pointer, Bunas, Crossan, Zisman, Harlow, Sykes, Sharp, Matheson, Crow, Maurer, KJohnson, Marlow, Davis, Shook, Tripp, Ralph, Rowland, Morgan-Parmett

DEBATE 101 SUMMARY

There are few things I want to add in the end to help you be a better debater, much less a K debater. As a debater, there are many different things you need to do in order to be prepared to debate. There is no one large thing you can do to be a great debater, you must put together all of the small things. It really is the small things that count. You must think that you want to do everything you can where when the debate starts, you spend your prep time writing/comparing important things in the debate, not doing things you could have done at home.

Category 1 – Pre-Tournament Prep!

- Sleep – You can never get caught up on sleep at a debate tournament.
- Health – You aren't at your best when sick, and you make others sick
- Packing – Pack the day before you leave – Don't forget important items.
- Pack your debate evidence the day before. Don't leave your 1ac at home.
- Prepare your pre-flows of 1ac and 1nc arguments.
- Get supplies together. You need things like pens and paper to debate.
- Do speaking drills constantly. Notice: Speaking/not necc. Speed drills.
- Filing – Make sure you file all of the evidence, rather than having criss-crossed files or worse the pile
- Scouting – Stay on top of who your opponents are, their arguments etc...
- School – Do your homework before you go. It will be tiring.
- Medication – Make sure you take your medication. Pack well.
- Shower/Cleanliness – Don't stink up the van. Shower if needed to prevent such.
- Don't be LATE! There are reasons people decide to leave at certain times. Don't question it.
- Bring a Timer. I suggest a real old fashioned, not cell phone, timer.

Category II – Pre-round!

- Get up on time. Don't stay up late. It's more fun to win, I promise.
- When pairings come out, prep time begins. Move it move it...
- Try and get a good set up with the table, not having your back to the judge or other team. You need to see both throughout the whole debate.
- Set up speaking area, so you feel comfortable giving your speech.
- What do you know about the other team and the judge?
- Find your Chi! What helps you focus? Music? Reading?
- Get out the evidence you will use.
- Underline and highlight such evidence.
- Get water and go to the bathroom.
- Don't complain about food, unless you don't get any, then ask for food.
- Ask for a plan text if they play that way.

Category III – During the Round!

- Be focused. Look like you care. Don't be messy, and look organized.
- It's not how you start it's how you finish.
- Watch the critic.
- Don't build a Great Wall of China with accordions between you and the critic. Get only the essential in front of you.
- Don't be shady with disclosure. Be honest for the purpose of having a good debate.
- Don't give the critic the business. Use eye contact to communicate before and during round, you don't have to talk to them.
- Read all of the other teams evidence.
- Continuously prep for the last speech.
- Save prep for the last rebuttals.
- Everyone has to create a game-board.
- Go for something.
- Be nice to partner!
- Be nice to other team!
- Don't be shifty/shady!
- Don't steal prep. Be ready when you say your ready!

Category IV – After Round!

- Sleep. Especially if you have to debate the next day.
- Re-file. Don't say you'll do it later. Do it asap.
- Do round report forms. That way if you or your teammates debate this team again, you know what they will say most likely.
- Save your flows.
- Write down what the judge says.
- Shake hands. The hardest thing about being a champion is learning how to lose.
- Get all of your evidence.
- Get cites.
- Find your sanctuary to reflect.
- Stay in the room until the judge is finished.
- Don't eat too much at lunch so you can't perform at night.
- Write answers to arguments that challenged you right after you had the debate with them. Read their evidence again to write your answer.

I hope this handbook helps you as a coach or debater in engaging the current world of competitive policy debate. If this volume gets a lot of positive feedback, you can expect many more volumes to come that include advice from other coaches who are in the trenches of what some call debates clash of civilizations.

CAPITALISM K BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ebert in 95, :Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Rethinking Marxism
<http://www.ritsumei.ac.jp/acd/gr/gsce/d/rm.htm#95>, article here,
<http://www.geocities.com/redtheory/AO/AOVol5-1RedFeminism.html>

Jeffrey T. Nealon , 2006 is Professor of English at Penn State University, Post-Deconstructive? Negri, Derrida, and the Present State of Theory, *sympleke* 14.1/2 -2006- 68-80:

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of "Culture."* Pg. 127-128.

MASSUMI 2003 :Brian, <http://www.lumpen.com/fatherland/everywhere.html>

WILKIE 2002 :Rob, "covering the crisis: American intellectuals and 9/11" red critique #7 fall/winter 2002:

RED COLLECTIVE 2002 :*Democracy as Class Apartheid*, june 2002,
<http://www.redcritique.org/MayJune02/democracyasclassapartheid.htm>

Ferguson '04 :Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University, 2004, "Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire, pg. 10

Nick Beams, member of International Editorial Board and National Secretary of Australian Socialist Equality Party, 2003 "The Political Economy of American Militarism, part 2" July 2,
www.wsws.org/articles/2003/jul2003/nb2-j11_prn.shtml

BADIOU 2001 :Alain, "on evil: an interview with alain badiou" by cox and whalen, cabinet magazine online, issue 5, winter 01-02, <http://www.egs.edu/faculty/badiou/badiou-on-evil.html>

MARTIN 99 :Brian, *Ghandi Marg*, 21 -3- <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/99gm.html>

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at Ljubjana, "Repeating Lenin", 1997, www.lacan.com/replenin :

HEROD 2004 :James, getting free, 7th edition, <http://jamesherod.info/?sec=book&id=1>

Marc Weeks, and Frederic Maurel, "Voyages Across the Web of Time; Angkarn, Nietzsche and Temporal Colonization, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, September 1st, 1999

Meszaros 06 -Istvan, "Structural Crisis of Politics," *Monthly Review*, September, Proquest,-

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, *The Enemy of Nature*, p. 22-24

Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, 1976

Hanieh 06 :Adam, PhD student in Political Science at York University, Relay Magazine / In the Name of Democracy; "Relay Roundtable/Democracy Promotion and Neoliberalism in Iraq"
<http://inthenameofdemocracy.org/en/node/62>

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of "Culture."* Pg. 49-51

Zizek 97 :Slavoj, "Multiculturalism, or, the cultural logic of multinational capitalism," *New Left Review* # 224 p. 34-35

Zizek 97 :Slavoj, a philosopher and psychoanalyst, also a senior researcher at the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities, in Essen, Germany, "Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism" *New Left Review* 1/225, September-October, < <http://newleftreview.org/?view=1919>>

Henessy '94 :Rosemary, Professor of English @ SUNY Albany, Queer Theory, Left Politics, Fall 1994, Rethinking Marxism, Vol 7, 3, 90-2

Zavarzadeh in 95 :Mas'ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, post-ality: Marxism and postmodernism, *post-ality the -dis-simulations of cybercapitalism*

Jeffrey T. Nealon IN 2006 is Professor of English at Penn State University, Post-Deconstructive? Negri, Derrida, and the Present State of Theory, *symploke* 14.1/2 -2006- 68-80

Kevin Cryderman, "Jane and Louisa: The Tapestry Of Critical Paradigms: Hutcheon, Lyotard, Said, Dirlik, And Brodber," 2000, <http://65.107.211.206/post/caribbean/brodber/kcry1.html>,

Laura Bartlett Snyder, Doctoral Fellow in the English Department at Louisville, "An Introduction," 2000, <http://athena.louisville.edu/a-s/english/babo/snyder/bounintro.html>, accessed 10/15/02

The Alternative Orange, October 29 2003, "The Critique of Universalism and the Politics of Identity," Vol 5, http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/5/v5n1_cs4.html

Zavarzadeh in 95 :Mas'ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, post-ality: Marxism and postmodernism, *post-ality the -dis-simulations of cybercapitalism*

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2002, Revolution at the Gates, p. 270-72

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2004, interviewed by Glyn Daly, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations With Zizek, p. 151-52

Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, 2004, Conversations With Zizek, p. 14-16

Stephen Tumino, prof. of English at Pitt, Spring 2001 "What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before," The Red Critique 1, Spring, www.geocities.com/redtheory/redcritique/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm :

Jeffrey T. Nealon in 98; Alterity Politics: Ethics and Performative Subjectivity, Duke University Press, 1998. 208 pgs. P 2-4

Amrohini J. Sahay, English Graduate Student at Syracuse University, Fall/Winter 1995, " 'Cyber-Materialism' and the Invention of the Cybercultural Everyday," The Alternative Orange: Vol. 5, No. 1 -pp. 56-64- http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/5/v5n1_cm.html

Barbara Epstein, dept History of Consciousness, UC Santa Cruz, Winter 1998 NEW POLITICS, <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue24/epstei24.htm>

Jason Glynos, university of essex, "Symptoms of a Decline in Symbolic Faith, or, Zizek's Anti-capitalism," Paragraph Volume 24, Issue 2, 2001, pg. 85-86

Barbara Epstein, History @ UCSC, 1995, "Why Post-Structuralism is a dead end for progressive thought," Socialist Review, 25.2

Young 2006 :Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, "Putting Materialism back into Race Theory", <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>

Foster, Oregon University Department of Sociology Professor, 05

-John B., Monthly Review, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>, September,-

Foster 05 -John, "Organizing the Ecological Revolution," *The Monthly Review*, v. 57, n. 5, October, www.monthlyreview.org/1005jbf.htm -

Marko 2003—5/14, <https://www2.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html>

Istvan Meszaros, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, 1995, *Beyond Capital*, p. 37-38.

Meszaros IN 89 :Istvan, Chair of philosophy @ U. of Sussex, *The Power of Ideology*, p. 232-234

Murray Bookchin, Professor of Social Theory at Ramapo College, 1990, *Remaking Society*, pp. 128-129

Nick Dyer-Witheford, Professor of Information and Media Studies at the University of Western Ontario, 1999, "Cyber-Marx," p.140-142

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, "Capitalism and Genocide", #36, <http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html>

Cerni, *cultural logic* electronic collection of Marxist Theory and Practice independent writer, 07

-Paula, "The Age of Consumer Capitalism", <http://clogic.eserver.org/2007/Cerni.pdf>,-

Harvey, Professor of Anthropology City University of New York, 2006

-David, *The Limits to Capital*, p. 444-5,-

Webb, National Communist Party Chairman, 04

-Sam, People's Weekly World Newspaper, <http://www.pww.org/article/view/4967/1/207/0>, March 20-

Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Senegal, 2004, *The Liberal Virus*, pg. 23-4

Helen Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vennont, 2006 "Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women's Literature", *Postcolonial Text*, 2.1, <http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pctlarticle/view/Article/491/174>

Gill in 2000 :Stephen, York Political Science, "The Constituion of Global Capitalism", <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/press/010gill.htm>:

Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Senegal, 2004, *The Liberal Virus*, pg. 40-2

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2004, *Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle*, p. 71-74

Stephen Tumino, prof. of English at Pitt, Spring 2001, "What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before," *The Red Critique* 1, Spring, <http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm>

Holloway 05 -John, 8-16, Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh , "Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?", <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>-

Bhandari 06 -Rakesh, UC Berkeley Department of Rhetoric lecturer "Poverty and Capitalism by Barbara Harriss-White", 4/11/06, <http://ricardo.ecn.wfu.edu/~cottrell/OPE/archive/0604/0025.html>,-

Wood 98 :Ellen, PhD from UCLA in political science and *Monthly Review*, the independent socialist magazine co-editor *Monthly Review* "Class compacts, the welfare state, and epochal shifts -a reply to Frances Fox Piven and Richard A Cloward", January 1998, Proquest:

JOEL WENDLAND IN 2006 :managing editor of political affairs, nov-dec 2006. Book Review: *A Postcapitalist Politics*, by J.K. Gibson-Graham <http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/articleview/4602/1/230?PrintableVersion=enabled>

Disch 99 -Linda,associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota, *Theory & Event* 3:1-

Heather Jon Maroney, professor of sociology and anthropology at Carleton University, Fall 1998, Cultural Logic, "On J.K. Gibson-Graham," online: <http://eserver.org/clogic/2-1/maroney.html>, accessed September 12, 2004

Epstein 98 :Barbara, Department of History of Consciousness at the University of Santa Cruz *New Politics*, Winter, <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue24/epstei24.htm>

Christopher Harman, editor of Socialist Worker and a leading member of the Socialist Workers Party in Britain, 1995, Economics Of The Madhouse

Wilkinson 05 -Will, CATO Institute Policy Report Vol. XXVII, February, <http://www.cato.org/research/articles/wilkinson-050201.html>-

DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, 2009 (Blake, Debate Coach at ... -project-and-switch-side-debate)

Althusser, L. (1971) 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses', in Lenin and Philosophy , trans. B. Brewster, Monthly Review Press, New York.

Baird, C. A. (1955) 'The college debater and the Red China issue', Central States Speech Journal , vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 5_/7.

Battaglia, D. (1995) 'Problematizing the self: a thematic introduction', in Rhetorics of Self Making , ed. D. Battaglia, Chicago, pp. 1_/15.

Benhabib, S. (1992) Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics ,

Bennett, T. (2004) 'Culture and government', in Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality , eds J. Z. Bratich, J. Packer & C. McCarthy, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, pp. 47_/66.

Bennett, T. (1990) Outside Literature , Routledge, London and New York.

Burns, J. M. (1954) 'Debate over collegiate debates', New York Times Magazine, 5 December, p. 12, p. 30.

Butler, J. (1997) Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative , Routledge, London and New York.

Cripe, N. (1957) 'Debating both sides in tournaments is ethical', Speech Teacher , vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 209_/212.

Day, D. (1966) 'The ethics of democratic debate', Central States Speech Journal , vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 5_/14.

Dell, G. (1958) 'In defense of debating both sides', Speech Teacher , vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 31_/34.

Ehninger, D. (1958) 'The debate about debating', Quarterly Journal of Speech , vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 128_/136.

Eubanks, R. & Baker, V. (1962) 'Toward an axiology of rhetoric', Quarterly Review of Speech , vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 157_/168.

Fine, G. A. (2001) Gifted Tongues: High School Debate and Adolescent Culture , Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Foucault, M. (1984) 'On the genealogy of ethics. An overview of work in progress', in The Foucault Reader , ed. P. Rabinow, Pantheon, New York, pp. 340_/372.

_____ (2001) Fearless Speech , ed. J. Pearson, Semiotext(e), Los Angeles.

Greenblatt, S. (1980) Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare , University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Greene, R. W. (1998) 'Another materialist rhetoric', Critical Studies in Mass Communication, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 21_/24.

_____ (1999) Malthusian Worlds: US Leadership and the Governing of the Population

Crisis , Westview Press, Boulder.

Habermas, J. (1979a) 'What is universal pragmatics?', in *Communication and the Evolution of Society* , trans. T. McCarthy, Beacon Press, Boston, pp. 1_/68.

_____ (1979b) 'Moral development and ego identity', in *Communication and the Evolution of Society* , trans. T. McCarthy, Beacon Press, Boston, pp. 69_/94.

1 2 4 CULTURAL STUDIES

_____ (1984) *Reason and the Rationalization of Society* , vol. 1 of *The Theory of Communicative Action* , trans. T. McCarthy, Beacon Press, Boston.

Hicks, D. (2002) 'The promise(s) of deliberative democracy', *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* , vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 223_/260.

Hicks, D. & Langsdorf, L. (1999) 'Regulating disagreement, constituting participants: a critique of proceduralist theories of democracy', *Argumentation* , vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 139_/160.

Hovland, C., Janis, I. & Kelly, H. (1953) *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Hovland, C., Lumsdaine, A. & Sheffield, F. (1949) *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II* , Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Klopf, D. W. & McCrosky, J. C. (1964) 'Debating both sides ethical? Controversy pau!', *Central States Speech Journal* , vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 36_/39.

Marable, M. (1984) *Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945_/1982*, University of Mississippi Press, Jackson.

Mill, J. S. (1859) *On Liberty* , J.W. Parker, London.

Miller, T. (1998) *Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and the Popular Media*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Miller, T. (1993) *The Well-Tempered Self: Citizenship, Culture and the Postmodern Subject* , Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Muir, S. (1993) 'A defense of the ethics of contemporary debate', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* , vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 277_/295.

Murphy, R. (1957) 'The ethics of debating both sides', *Speech Teacher* , vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1_/9.

Murphy, R. (1963) 'The ethics of debating both sides II', *Speech Teacher* , vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 242_/247.

Packer, J. (2002) 'Mobile communications and governing the mobile: truckers and CBs', *The Communication Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 39_/57.

Passavant, P. (1996) 'A moral geography of liberty: John Stuart Mill and the American free speech discourse', *Social and Legal Studies* , vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 301_/319.

Nelson, C. & Gaonkar, G. (1998) 'Cultural studies and the politics of disciplinarity: an introduction', in *Cultural Studies* , eds C. Nelson & D. Gaonkar, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 1_/19.

Newman, R. P. (1963) *Pittsburgh Code for Academic Debate*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

Nichols, E. R. (1926) 'A historical sketch of intercollegiate debating: I', *Quarterly*

Journal of Speech , vol. 12, pp. 213_/220.

Rehg, W. (2002) 'The argumentation theorist in deliberative democracy',
Controversia: An International Journal of Debate and Democratic Renewal, vol.
1, no. 1, pp. 18_/42.

Ross, A. (1989) No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture , Routledge, London and
New York.

Rosteck, T. (1999) 'Approaching the intersection: issues of identity, politics, and
cultural practice', in At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies ,
ed. T. Rosteck, Guilford Press, New York, pp. 1_/23.

Singh, N. P. (1998) 'Culture/wars: recoding empire in an age of democracy',
American Quarterly , vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 471_/522.

Thompson, W. (1944) 'Discussion and debate: a re-examination', Quarterly Journal
of Speech , vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 288_/299.

Williams, R. (1958) Culture and Society, 1780_/1950, Harper Torchbooks, New
York.

Windes, C. R. & Kruger, A. (2004) Championship Debating: West Point National
Debate Tournament, Final Debate and Critiques, 1949 _/1960, [online] Available
at: <http://www.wfu.edu/orgnaizations/ndt>.

FIRST PRIORITY TO FIRST AMERICANS BIBIOGRAPHY

Churchill, Ward Former professor of Indian Studies at the University of Colorado-Bolder,

--- From a Native Son: Selected Essays on Indigenism, 1985-1995, isbn 0896085538, 1985

--- On the Justice of Roosting Chickens: Reflections on the Consequences of U. S. Imperial Arrogance and Criminality, isbn 1902593790, 2003

---Struggle for the Land, 2001

--- Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America by Ward Churchill, Derrick Jensen and Mike Ryan (Apr 1, 2007)

--- A Little Matter of Genocide, 2001.

--- Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement (Classics Edition) (South End Press Classics Series) by Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall (Nov 1, 2001)

--- Acts of Rebellion. 2002

--- Since Predator Came, 2005

Deloria, Jr., Vine, Board Member, National Museum of The American Indian

----Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto, isbn 0806121297, 1988

----God Is Red: A Native View of Religion, 30th Anniversary Edition, isbn 1555914985, 2003

----Spirit & Reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr., Reader, isbn: 1555914306, 1999

Fixico, Donald - Shawnee, Sace and Fox, Muscogee Creek and Seminole, Thomas Bowlus Distinguished Professor of American Indian History at the University of Kansas, The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian studies and traditional knowledge, 2003

Garrouette, Eva Marie Professor of sociology at Boston College, Real Indians: identity and the survival of Native America, 2003

Grande, Sandy Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought, isbn 0742518299, 2004

Grinde, Donald A., and Johansen, Bruce E., and Zinn, Howard Ecocide of Native America: Environmental Destruction of Indian Lands and Peoples, isbn 0940666529 1994

Grounds, Richard A.

(Yuchi/Seminole), Director Of the Euchee Language project in Oklahoma, Native Voices: American Indian identity and resistance, isbn 0700612599, 2003

Hall, Anthony J. Professor of Globalization Studies, University of Lethbridge, The American Empire and The Fourth World: The Bowl With One Spoon Part 1, isbn 0773530061, 2005

Kato, Masahide - Professor of Political Science, University of Hawaii, "Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze." Alternatives, Volume 18 Number 3 Summer, 1993

Mihesuah, Devon Abbott and Wilson, Angela Cavendar - Professor of applied indigenous studies and history at Northern Arizona University, assistant professor of indigenous history at Arizona State University, Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities, isbn 0803282923, 2004

Nunn, Kenneth B. - Professor of Law University of Florida Levin, "Law as a Eurocentric Enterprise" Law and Inequality, 15:323, Spring1997

Simpson, Leanne - Faculty member of the Centre for World Indigenous Knowledge and Research at Athabasca University, Canada "Anticolonial strategies for the recovery and maintenance of Indigenous Knowledge", The American Indian Quarterly, volume 28 no3&4, 2004

Tinker, George - Author, and activist in urban American Indian communities, Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation, isbn 0800636813, 2004

FRAMEWORK K SUPPORT/DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE

(These are most of the modern day articles on debate)

Balin and Siegel 2003 (Sharon Bailin and Harvey Siegel, Professor of Education, The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education, Edited by *Nigel Blake, Paul Smeyers, Richard Smith, and Paul Standish*- Chapter 10. Critical Thinking)

Bleiker in 98 [asst. prof. of International Studies at Pusan National University (Roland, "Retracing and redrawing the boundaries of events: Postmodern interferences with international theory", *Alternatives*, Oct-Dec 1998, Vol. 23, Issue 4

Bleiker in 2003 [Roland, School of Political Science, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Discourse and Human Agency

Bleiker, Senior lecturer, peace and conflict studies 00 (Roland, *Contending images of World Politics*, 2000 p. 228

Bleiker. in 00 [Ph.D. visiting research and teaching affiliations at Harvard, Cambridge, Humboldt, Tampere, Yonsei and Pusan National University as well as the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology and the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague, (Roland, *Popular Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics*, Cambridge University Press

Bowers 03 (C. A. Bowers has taught at the University of Oregon and Portland State University, and now, in retirement, serves as adjunct professor of environmental studies at the University of Oregon. "Assessing Richard Rorty's Ironist Individual Within the Context of the Ecological Crisis" *The Trumpeter* 19,2 (2003).
<http://trumpeter.athabasca.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/91/94>

BRODA-BAHM AND MURPHY 1994 [Kenneth and Thomas L, "A Defense of Critique Arguments: Beyond the Resolutational Question," *CEDA Yearbook*, 1994, ceda website]

Brook 2009 (Angus, University of Notre Dame, Australia. The Potentiality of Authenticity in Becoming a Teacher. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol. 41, No. 1, 2009 - doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00474.x)

BURCH -ASSISTANT PF PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY -0:1 Kerry, "The Significance of Critical Pedagogy for Cultural Studies" *Theory & Event*, 5:3

Cropsey 87 (Joseph, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, "History of Political Philosophy,"

Dillon -99 (Michael Dillon, Prof of Politics, University of Lancaster, *Moral Spaces*, p. 97-98)

Frameworks Institute '03 ("The FrameWorks Perspective: Strategic Frame Analysis",
<http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/strategicanalysis/perspective.shtml>

GEHRKE 1998 [Pat J, Former Debate Coach and Rhetorical Scholar, "Critique Arguments as Policy Analysis: Policy Debate Beyond the Rationalist Perspective," *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 19, 1998, pp. 18-39]

Gudorf and Hutchinson 03 (Christine and James, Professors of Religious Studies at Florida International University, *Boundaries: A Casebook in Environmental Ethics*, p. 5

Hicks and Green 2005 Darrin and Ronald Walter, "Lost Convictions: Debating Both Sides and the Etherical Self Fashioning of Liberal Citizens," *Cultural Studies*, vol 19 no 5, Jan

Kappeler 95 (Susanne, *The Will to Violence: The politics of personal behavior*, Pg. 10-11)

Larochelle '99 (Gilbert, *Philosophy Today* (Summer Rudi Vlsker, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2003 ("Is ethics fundamental? Questioning Levinas on irre-;P;;nsibility", *Continental Philosophy Review*, 36: 263-302

Josina Makau, Responsible Communication "Argumentation Instruction in the Face of Global Perils," p. 329

Istvan Meszaros, 1995 (Beyond Capital, "Marginal Utility' and neo-classical Economic,s",
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/meszaros/works/beyond-capital/ch03-2.htm>)

MITCHELL 98 [Gordon R.; University of Pittsburgh, "Pedagogical Possibilities for Argumentative Agency In Academic Debate," *Argumentation and Advocacy*, Vol. 35 Issue 2, pp. 41-60]

NADIA C [citation: better than yours, CRIMETHINC, <http://www.crimethinc.com/texts/selected/asfuck.php>]

Nayar School of Law, University of Warwick. 1999 [Jayan, Fall, SYMPOSIUM; RE-FRAMING INTERNATIONAL LAW FOR THE 21ST CENTURY; Orders of Inhumanity, *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems*, 9 *Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs.* 599]

Pattison 2001 (George, Dean of King's College, Cambridge. *The Later Heidegger*. Edited by Tim Crane and Jonathan Wolff *University College London. Ebook*)

KENDALL R. PHILLIPS, SPACES OF INVENTION: DISSENSION, FREEDOM, AND THOUGHT IN FOUCAULT, PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC, 2002

SANTOS 2003 [Boaventura de Sousa, "Collective Suicide?," *Bad Subjects*, Issue #63, April 2003, <http://bad.eserver.org/issues/2003/63/santos.html>, spurly] WILLIAM

SHANAHAN 93 [William Shanahan is one of the best debate coaches ever involved with the activity, formerly FHSU debate coach, phd and proleptic rhetorical scholar, "kritik of thinking" *Debaters Research Guide*, 1993, <http://www.ctcd.edu/communications/forensics/documents/KritikofThinking.pdf>]

William Spanos, *Comparative Literature and Bumbling*, 2001 ("The Specter of History: Rethinking Thinking in the Post-Cold War Age," *Mosaic*, Vol. 34)

SPANOS IN 2000 [William, *America's shadow: anatomy of an empire*, isbn: 0-8166-3337-1]

Standish 1997 (Paul Standish, Institute for Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Dundee, *Heidegger and the Technology of Further Education*. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 1997)

Thomson 04 (Iain, Dept. of Philosophy, Univ. of New Mexico. "Ontology and Ethics at the Intersection of Phenomenology and Environmental Philosophy", published in *Ecophenomenology: Back to the Earth Itself* p.389-91)

WARREN 2008 [Beckett, MA Thesis, "Dawn of a new apocalypse: Engagements With The Apocalyptic Imagination In 2012 and Primitivist Discourse," December 2008]

FRAMEWORK ANTI-K BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Some are already listed above in text)

Kemerling, 97 professor of philosophy at Newberry College, (Garth, "Definition and Meaning", <http://www.philosophypages.com/lg/e05.htm>)

Michael Ignatieff, 2004 - Carr Professor of Human Rights Practice, Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at the JFK School of Government, Harvard University, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*, p. 20-1

Adolf G. Gundersen, 2000 - Associate Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, *Political Theory and Partisan Politics*, p. 108-9

Christopher C. Joyner (prof. of International law at Georgetown) Spring 1999 "teaching international law: views from an international relations political scientist" *ILSA journal of international & comparative law* 5 *ILSA J Int'l & Comp L* 377.

Ruth Lessl Shively 2000 - Associate Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, *Political Theory and Partisan Politics*, p. 182-3

Christopher A. Bracey, September 2006 - Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, *Southern California Law Review*, 79 *S. Cal. L. Rev.* 1231, p. 1311-1314, LexisNexis

Thomas A. Spragens, 2000 - Professor of Political Science at Duke, *Political Theory and Partisan Politics*, p. 90-1

Mary Dietz, 2000 - Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, *Political Theory and Partisan Politics*, p. 131-2

John Rawls. 1999, *The Law of Peoples*, p. 56-57

Alan Coverstone, 1995 - "An Inward Glance: A Response To Mitchell's Outward Activist Turn," DRG, URL: <http://www.wfu.edu/Student-organizations/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Coverstone1995China.htm>

Owen 02, University of Southampton (David, "Reorienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 3, <http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/3/653>)

Fine, 2000 - Department of Sociology Northwestern University - Gary, "GAMES AND TRUTHS: Learning To Construct Social Problems In High School Debate", 103-104.

Boggs, 1997 - Professor of Political Science, '97 - Carl, National University, *Theory & Society* 26, December, p. 760-1.

Sankaran Krishna, 1993 - Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, *Alternatives*, v. 18

Best and Kellner, 2001 - Steven Best, Assoc. Prof Phil. And Human. U Texas and Douglas Kellner, Phil. Of Ed. Chair, "Postmodern Politics and the Battle for the Future," *Illuminations*, www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/kell28.htm

Muir 1993 - Star A. PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC, "A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate," v26, n4, p.288

Shampa Biswas, 2007 - Professor of Politics at Whitman College, December 2007, "Empire and Global Public Intellectuals: Reading Edward Said as an International Relations Theorist," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 1, p. 124

John J. Mearsheimer, 1995 - Realism heavyweight champion, *International Security*, Vol. 20, No

Alastair J.H. Murray, 1997 - *Politics AND Realism*, p

Fuyuki Kurusawa 2004'Constellations Vol 11 No. 4

Todd May, 2005, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM • vol 31 nos 5-6 • pp. 517-531

David E. McClean, 2001 - The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope - Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy.

P. H. LIOTTA, 2005 - Security Dialogue - Vol. 36(1): 49-70

HEIDEGGER K BIBLIOGRAPHY

¹Heidegger, Martin. What is Called Thinking?, Harper & Row publishers, 1954 – Page 4

¹Barbara Dalle Pezze, 2006 - PhD in Philosophy by the University of Hong. Heidegger on Gelassenheit, ISSN 1393-614X, Minerva - An Internet Journal of Philosophy 10 : 94-122

Stenstad 2006 (Gail, professor in the Department of Philosophy and Humanities at East Tennessee State University, associate editor of *Heidegger Studies*, and a member of the board of directors of the International Association for Environmental Philosophy. "Transformations Thinking After Heidegger" University of Wisconsin Press. Page(s) 53-54)

Dreyfus 2003 (Hubert L, Professor at the University of California, Berkeley "Heidegger on the connection between nihilism, art, technology, and politics." Cambridge Collections Online © Cambridge University Press, 2007. Chapter 13)

Beistegui 2007 (Miguel de Beistegui, Professor of Philosophy University of Warwick, Coventry. Questioning Politics, or Beyond Power. *European Journal of Political Theory* 2007; 6; 87. Sage Publications)

Swazo 2002 (Norman Swazo, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, *Crisis Theory and World Order: Heideggerian Reflections*, pp. 73-74)

Geiman 2001 (Clare Pearson, "Heidegger's Antigones." A Companion to Heidegger's Introduction to Metaphysics. Ed. Richard Polt and Gregory Fried. New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Foltz 1995 (Bruce V. Professor of Philosophy, UTD, *Inhabiting the Earth*. 1995, Page(s) 3-4)

Rutherford 1999 (Paul, professor of environmental politics in the Department of Government and Public Administration at the University of Sydney, Australia, 1999, *Discourses of the Environment*, p. 37-38)

Lovbrand 2006 (Eva, Phd Candidate in environmental science at Kalmar University, "Planting Trees to Mitigate Climate Change: Contested Discourses of Ecological Modernization, Green Governmentality and Civic Environmentalism, Feb. 2006)

McWhorter 1992 (Ladelle, Professor of Philosophy, Northeast Missouri State, HEIDEGGER AND THE EARTH, p.viii)

Thomson 2001 (Ian, Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Mexico. Heidegger on Ontological Education, or; How We Become What We Are. *Inquiry*, 44, 243-68, March 2001)

Pezze 2006 (Barbara Dalle , PhD in Philosophy by the University of Hong. Heidegger on Gelassenheit, ISSN 1393-614X, Minerva - An Internet Journal of Philosophy 10 (2006): 94-122)

Aho 2007 (Kevin A. PhD University of South Florida, is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Florida Gulf Coast University. Acceleration and Time Pathologies: The critique of psychology in Heidegger's Beiträge. *Time Society* 2007; 16; 25. Sage Publications)

Herman 1997 (Arthur, Professor of History, George Mason, THE IDEA OF DECLINE IN WESTERN HISTORY, 1997, p.336-7)

Zimmerman 1981 (Michael E. Zimmerman, Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University; *Eclipse of the Self: The Development of Heidegger's Concept of Authenticity*, pp. 245-248)

Kockelmans 1985 (Joseph, Professor of Philosophy at Penn State University, HEIDEGGER AND SCIENCE, p.254)

Thiele 1995 (Leslie Paul, Professor of Political Science, University of Florida, TIMELY MEDITATIONS, p. 186)

Kateb 1992 (George, political theorist, Princeton, *The Inner Ocean*, p. 149)

Weitzman 2008 (Erica, Doctoral candidate in Comparative Literature at New York University. Necessary Interruption: Traces of the Political in Levinas. *Theory and Event*, Volume 11, Issue 2, 2008)

Pattison 2001 (George, Dean of King's College, Cambridge. *The Later Heidegger*. Edited by Tim Crane and Jonathan Wolff *University College London. Ebook*)

Beistegui 2007 (Miguel de Beistegui, Professor of Philosophy University of Warwick, Coventry. Questioning Politics, or Beyond Power. *European Journal of Political Theory* 2007; 6; 87. Sage Publications)

Beckman 2000 (Tad, Professor of Philosophy, Harvey Mudd College, "Martin Heidegger and Environmental Ethics <http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML>")

Baudrillard 1993 (Jean, *The Transparency of Evil, Essays on Extreme Phenomenon*, Pages 97-99)

Herman 1997 (Arthur, Professor of History, George Mason, *THE IDEA OF DECLINE IN WESTERN HISTORY*, 1997, p.336-7)

Hicks 2003 (Steven V., Professor and chair of philosophy at Queens College of the CUNY, "Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Foucault: Nihilism and Beyond," *Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters*, Ed. Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg, p. 109)

Dreyfus 1996 (Hubert, "Being and Power: Heidegger and Foucault" University of California Berkeley http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/html/paper_being.html)

Sabatiano 07 (Charles J., Daemen College. "A Heideggerian Reflection on the Prospects of Technology" reprinted in *Janus Head* 10.1. p. 63-76.

Eric Katz, 2000 - associate professor of philosophy and director of the Science, Technology, and Society Program, New Jersey Institute of Technology; recognized pioneer, environmental ethics, 2K, *Nature as Subject: Human Obligation and Natural Community*)

Haynes 08 (John D., Professorial Visiting Fellow School of Information Systems, Technology and Management University of New South Wales, "Calculative Thinking and Essential Thinking in Heidegger's Phenomenology,"

http://wwwdocs.fce.unsw.edu.au/sistm/stafilHeidegger_calculation_essential_March08.pdt)

Matt Szabo, 2002 - PhD Candidate in Geography at The University of Manchester, "Managerial ecology: Zygmunt

Bauman and the gardening culture of modernity," *Environments*, Vol. 30, No.3, 2002

Hwang 99 (Ph. D. candidate in political science at the University of Connecticut. "Ecological panoptic ism; the problematization of the ecological crisis")

Olivier 07 (Bert, Professor of Philosophy at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, "Nature as 'abject', critical psychology, and 'revolt': The pertinence of Kristeva," *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(3), 2007, pp. 443--469)

Barnett, Fellow in the School of Social and Environmental Enquiry at University of Melbourne, 2001 (Jon, and a

New Zealand Sci and Tech Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Canterbury and serves on the editorial boards of several scholarly journals, May 4, *The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era*, pg. 47 p3 -pg. 49 pl)

Litfin 99 (Karen T.; assistant professor of political science at the University of Washington in Seattle;

"Constructing Environmental Security and Ecological Interdependence"; *Global Governance*, 10752846, Jul-Sep99, Vol. 5, Issue 3; Academic Search Premier; Ebsco

Broda-Bahn 99 (Kenneth T, Assistant Professor in the Mass Communication and Communication Studies Department at Towson University, "Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security" *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 10511431, Spring99, Vol. 35, Issue 4)]-

Rowe 03 (Stan, Retired ecology teacher, professor emeritus at the University of Saskatchewan,

<http://trumpeter.athabasca.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/95198>)

Jenkins 06 (Martin Pathways School of Philosophy, "Heidegger, Technology, and Our Future," *Philosophy Pathways*, Issue 123, http://www.philosophos.com/philosophy_article_137.html)

Martin Heidegger, 1966, *Discourse on Thinking*, p. 52-57]

Smith 08 (Mick, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, "Suspended Animation: Radical Ecology,

Sovereign Powers, and Saving the (Natural) World", *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, Vol. 2, No.1, 2008, pp 4 5)

Matthews 01 (Richard, Queen's University, "The Metaphysics of Appearance: Heidegger's Critique of Technology," <http://www.mun.ca/phil/codgito/vol2/v2doc3.html>)

Antolick 02 (Matthew, Master of Arts Department of Philosophy University of South Florida, "Deep Ecology and Heideggerian Phenomenology," <http://etd.fcla.edu/JSF/SFE0000104/antolick.pdf>)

Condella 01 (Craig A., Fordham University, "Overcoming the Destining Of Technological Being," Fall 2001 Symposium: Humanity's Place in the Cosmos, November 6, 2001, <http://www.fordham.edu/philosophy/fps/symposia/2001fall/condella.htm>)

Dalby 1998 (*Ecological metaphors of security: World politics in the biosphere. Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, Jul-Sep 1998, Vol. 23, Issue 3)

Peters and Irwin 2 (Michael, Research Professor of Education at University of Glasgow, and Ruth, PhD University of Glasgow, *Earthsongs: ecopoetics, Heidegger and dwelling. The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy* 18(1))

Joel J. Kassiola. 03, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences @ San Francisco State University (Can Environmental Ethics 'Solve' Environmental Problems and Save the World? Yes, but First We Must Recognise the Essential Normative Nature of Environmental Problems, *Environmental Values*, 12)

Godzinski 05 (Ronald Jr., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, "(En)Framing Heidegger's Philosophy of Technology," *Essays in Philosophy*, Vol. 6, No. 1, <http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/godzinski.html>)

Heidegger and the Earth: Essays in Environmental Philosophy (New Studies in Phenomenology and Hermeneutics) [Hardcover] [Ladelle McWhorter](#) (Editor), [Gail Stenstad](#) (Editor)

Ladelle McWhorter holds the James Thomas Chair in the Department of Philosophy and is jointly appointed a professor in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexualities Studies at the University of Richmond.

Gail Stenstad is a professor emerita in the Department of Philosophy at East Tennessee State University. University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division; 2 Expanded edition (June 17, 2009) ISBN-10: 0802099882

WHITENESS K BIBLIOGRAPHY!

Alcoff, Linda 2006, *Feminist Professor, The Political Critique of Identity: from Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*.

Applebaum '10 [Barbara Applebaum, Associate Professor in Cultural Foundations of Education at Syracuse University. "White Ignorance and Denials of Complicity: On the Possibility of Doing Philosophy in Good Faith." *The Center Must Not Hold: White Women Philosophers on the Whiteness of Philosophy*. Lanham , MD : Lexington Books. Edited by George Yancy (2010).]

Bailey '10 [Alison Bailey. "On Intersectionality and the Whiteness of Feminist Philosophy." *The Center Must Not Hold: White Women Philosophers on the Whiteness of Philosophy*. Lanham , MD : Lexington Books. Edited by George Yancy (2010).]

bell hooks, Author, *Feminist, Professor at Berea College, 1996 Killing Rage: Ending Racism*

Birt '04 [Robert Birt, Professor of Philosophy Morgan State University. "The Bad Faith of Whiteness." In George Yancy, ed., *What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question*. 55-64.]

Brayton '06 [Sean Brayton, "Malibu's Most Undercover Guru": Deconstructing Race thru a Comical Pedagogy of Whiteness," *TOPIA* 14, 57. 2006.]

BRAYTON '08 [Sean Brayton. "A CRITICAL POSTMODERN RESPONSE TO MULTICULTURALISM IN POPULAR CULTURE." A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES (Human Kinetics), THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, April 2008.]

Buff, 2005 [Rachel Ida. *American Quarterly*, Volume 57, Number 4, December 2005, pp.1263-1272 (Review). *Transnational Visions: Reinventing Immigration Studies*]

Carey et al.. 2009 Jane Carey, Leigh Boucher, and Katherine Ellinghaus. *Re-Orienting Whiteness*. - Page 1

Chapin, 2003 [Jessica. *UT. Ethnography at the Border*.]

Charles Mills 01, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, in 2001 (*Faces of Environmental Racism*, Laura Westra, Bill Lawson eds. p. 89-90)

Curry '04 [Blanche Radford Curry, Professor Philosophy NC State University, Fayetteville. "Whiteness and Feminism: Déjà Vu Discourses, What's Next?" In George Yancy, ed., *What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question*. 243-62.]

DiAngelo, education faculty, University of Washington, 2006 (Robin J., *Whiteness Studies author, INCLUSION IN URBAN EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS: ADDRESSING ISSUES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE*, Edited by Denise E. Armstrong and Brenda J. McMahon, p. 216-7)

Dobrowolsky '07 [Alexandra. Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Political Science, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia. "(In)Security and Citizenship: Security, Im/migration and Shrinking Citizenship." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, Volume 8, Number 2 July 2007 Article 11.]

Doezema, 2004 PHD Thesis. *Sex slaves and discourse masters – The historical construction of the trafficking of women*.

Dylan Rodriguez, Professor University of California Riverside, November 2007 Kritika Kultura
American Globality and The U.S. Prison Regime: State violence and White Supremacy from Abu Ghraib to Stockton to Bagong Diwa”

Farr '04 [Arnold Farr, Ass. Professor of Philosophy Saint Joseph's University. "Whiteness Visible: Enlightenment Racism and the Structure of Racialized Consciousness." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 143-58.]

Ferguson, 2000 Cultural Values ISSN 1363-5179 Volume 4 Number 4 October 2000 pp. 419-444

Frank B. Wilderson III 2007, Assistant Professor of African American Studies & Drama at UC Irvine, Warfare in the American Homeland-Policing and Prison in a Penal Democracy pg31-33

Giroux 08 , a professor in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University ,Henry Giroux,; Rethinking the Promise of Critical Education Under an Obama Regime 02 December 2008, Chronis

Gordon '04 [Lewis R. Gordon. Professor Africana Studies Brown University. "Critical Reflections on Three Popular Tropes in the Study of Whiteness." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 173-94.]

Harding '10 [Sandra Harding. Professor at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies; Former Director of the UCLA Center for the Study of Women. "Forward." The Center Must Not Hold: White Women Philosophers on the Whiteness of Philosophy. Lanham , MD : Lexington Books. Edited by George Yancy (2010).]

Headley '04 [Clevie Headley, Ass. Professor Philosophy Florida Atlantic University. "Deligitimizing the Normativity of "Whiteness": A Critical Africana Philosophical Study of the Metaphoricity of "Whiteness." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 87-106.]

Henry '04 [Paget Henry, Professor of Sociology & Africana Studies Brown University. "Whiteness and Africana Phenomenology." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 195-210.]

Hill 1997, Shelton K. former professor Biola University "African American Student's Motivation to Participate in Intercollegiate Debate", Southern Journal of Forensics

Hooks, Bell 2004, Black Feminist theorist and Professor at Berea College, The Will to Change: Men masculinity and Love.

Jones '04 [Janine Jones, Professor of Philosophy UNC Greensboro. "The Impairment of Empathy in Goodwill Whites for African Americans." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 65-86.]

Kennedy '96 [Liam. "Alien Nation: White Male Paranoia and Imperial Culture in the United States." Journal of American Studies, 30(1), 87-100. JSTOR.]

Kincheloe, 1999 The Struggle to Define and Reinvent Whiteness: A Pedagogical Analysis Joe L. Kincheloe Source: College Literature 26 (Fall 1999): 162- .

Leonard 2005, Moulard Valentine. Professor of Philosophy at Univ. Of Memphis. "Revolutionary Becomings: Negritude's Anti-Humanist Humanism"

Leonardo, 2002 Race Ethnicity and Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2002 The Souls of White Folk: critical - pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse - ZEUS LEONARDO California State University,

Loomba 09 [Prof of English at U of Penn Ania Comparative Literature 61.2 Duke University Press]

Martinez, 2006 [Oscar J. Martinez. Regents Professor of History at the University of Arizona. Troublesome Border.]

McClendon '04 [John H. McClendon III, Ass. Professor of African-American studies & American cultural studies at Bates College. "On the Nature of Whiteness and the Ontology of Race: Toward a Dialectical Materialist Analysis." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 211-26.]

McIntosh, Peggy: 1988, Associate director of the Wellesley Collage Center for Research on Women; White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack

MILLS '07 [CHARLES W. Northwestern University. "Comments on Shannon Sullivan's Revealing Whiteness." Journal of Speculative Philosophy, Vol. 21, No. 3, 2007.]In chapter 7

Mills '04 [Charles W. Mills, Professor of Philosophy at University of Illinois at Chicago. "Racial Exploitation and the Wages of Whiteness." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 25-54.] 27-8

Nealon, 98 [Refraining, Becoming-Black: Repetition and Difference in Amiri Baraka's Blues People, Jeffrey T. - sympleke 6.1 (1998) 83-95, <http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/journals/sympleke/v006/6.1nealon.html>Prof of english at Penn State University]

Newman, 2009 Louise. Re-Orienting Whiteness. - Page 42

Outlaw '04 [Lucius T. Outlaw, Jr., Professor of Philosophy & Director, African-American Studies, Vanderbilt University. "Rehabilitate Racial Whiteness?" In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 159-72.]

Romero, 2008 Contemporary Justice Review Vol. 11, No. 1, March 2008, 23-37 Crossing the immigration and race border: A critical race theory approach to immigration studies Mary Romero* School of Justice and Social Inquiry, Arizona State University, Tempe, USA

Rootforce '10 ["Arizona Indigenous People and Allies Occupy Border Patrol Office." <http://www.rootforce.org/2010/05/21/arizona-indigenous-people-and-allies-occupy-border-patrol-office/> May 21st, 2010.]

Springer, Institute for Recovery from Racisms, 2006 (Pearlette E., Catholic Diocese of Gary, Indiana, www.dcgary.org/pastoral/African/antiracism/articles/econracism.htm, 2/25/07

Taylor '04 [Paul C. Taylor, Social Philosophy and American ethnic studies at University of Washington. "Silence and Sympathy: Dewey's Whiteness." In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 227-42.]

Tinker '96 George E. Tinker, Iliff School of Technology, 1996 [Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice, ed. Jace Weaver, p. 171-72]

Toni Morrison 1993, author and literary theorist, Nobel Prize in Literature Lecture, (http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1993/morrison-lecture.html)

VELEZ-IBANEZ, 1996 [Carlos G., Professor, School of Transborder Studies ASU, Border Visions.]

Wilderson III, former member of the Umkhonto we Sizwe, 2008 [Frank B., Incognegro: A Memoir of Exile and Apartheid South End Press, pg. 407-411]

Yancy '10 [George Yancy. Professor of Philosophy Duquesne University. "Introduction: Troublemaking Allies." *The Center Must Not Hold: White Women Philosophers on the Whiteness of Philosophy*. Lanham, MD : Lexington Books. Edited by George Yancy (2010).]

Yancy '04 [George Yancy, Review Editor of the American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience. "A Foucauldian (Genealogical) Reading of Whiteness: The Production of the Black Body/Self and the Racial Deformation of Pecola Breedlove in Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*." In George Yancy, ed., *What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question*. 107-42.]

Yancy 2004, Pennsylvania State University. All rights reserved. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 18.4 (2004) 273-299

Yancy, 2005 Yancy, George. - Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body

The Journal of Speculative Philosophy - New Series, Volume 19, Number 4, 2005, pp. 215-241

COMMON ANSWERS TO KRITIKS

SECURITY K ANSWERS

Fear, war and violence are inevitable, the impacts are inevitable

Moving away from security risks war

Abandoning security fails

Perm do plan and all parts of alt that don't = reject

Little parts of change solve. walt 91

Security of world order is possible -- 05

Insecurity and disorder are inevitable. This is key to effective planning -- 04

Impossible to transform politics w/out seeing the state -- shaw 99

Impact is extinction and refusal to engage in politics that makes violence inevitable

Even if war, violence and disorder are inevitable, escalation and the terminal impact isn't – approach the plan as a means to reduce the worst forms of violence. We can't guarantee a utopia but we can keep things from getting worse-Flynn 07, *The Edge of Disaster: Rebuilding a Resilient Nation*, p. 9-10

Moving away from security creates new challengers and increases the risk of war - Doran 99, *Survival, Summer*, p. 148-9

Abandoning security fails – all that will happen is that non-realists will be removed from office - Kavka 87, *Moral Paradoxes of Nuclear Deterrence*, p. 86-87

Even if war, violence and disorder are inevitable, escalation and the terminal impact isn't – approach the plan as a means to reduce the worst forms of violence. We can't guarantee a utopia but we can keep things from getting worse

Flynn 07, *The Edge of Disaster: Rebuilding a Resilient Nation*, p. 9-10

TERROR TALK ANSWERS

Terrorist attacks on 9/11 were real. No impact to discourse

Discourse is not stable focus - voter

Plan should be the focus of the debate

Discourse doesn't construct reality

The label "terrorist" is vital

Concept of terrorism solves

VERSUS. NARRATIVES

Narratives bad—

Narratives are bad: (1). They reify hegemonic structures through social assumptions and create structures of power of their own. (2). They prevent problem solving by obscuring problems with discursive assumptions. (3). They mask domination by preventing deliberation over truth claims. Proves the K can't solve and only creates the problems it tries to prevent

Patricia Ewick and Susan S. Silbey ... Law & Society Review, 00239216, 1995, Vol. 29, Issue 2

Liberal multiculturalism's embrace of narrative cannot be productive because it is inherently limited – their attempt to show the individuals beauty is the ultimate fake gesture based in the desire to see the other suffer.

Zizek 2008 In Defense of Lost Causes page 11-13

Narratives create the same oppressive nature as dominant discourse.

Coughlin 95 [Anne, Lewis F. Powell. "Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship." Virginia Law Review August edition.]

Narratives have the same problems as the system that they critique – they aren't innocent, they are manipulated for an intended purpose and their use of narrative is also a form of manipulation. Their project cannot address social agendas and has the same problems as dominant discourse.

Coughlin 95 [Anne, Lewis F. Powell. "Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship." Virginia Law Review August edition.]

It may be...to be represented.

Narratives feast on pre-conceived prejudices or guilt; they make it impossible to make accurate decisions – gutting solvency for their movement.

Hyman 98 [David. "Lies, Damned Lies, and Narrative" 73 Ind L J 797 Summer]

As EMTALA demonstrates...and empirical reality.

Here is a narrative good cite:

Narrative solvency (narratives are universally understood as an alternative to the rationality of the status quo, taken from

Rowland 87 Rowland (Robert C., Professor of Communication Studies, University of Kansas, Communication Monographs 54, p. 264).1987

The Rational World Paradigm, a taught and highly systemized method of human communication and decision-making, needs to be reconsidered before making reforms to human trafficking based visa law. Fisher, Professor of Communication, University of Southern California (Walter, "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument", Communication Monographs, Vol 51, 1984)

This paradigm is very familiar, having been in existence since Aristotle's Organon ... already been done on public argument are essays by Cox (1981), Goodnight (1980), Hynes, Jr. (1980), Lucaitas (1981), Pryor (1981). Sillars and Ganer (1982). and Zarefsky (1981).